The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

Vol. XLVI · DECEMBER 1960 · No. 4

Presidential Campaign 1960: A Symposium (Part II)

Contest for the Presidency
Overview — *N. Edd Miller* 355

Richard M. Nixon: Definition of an Image — *Bernard C. Kissel* 357

John F. Kennedy: Campaigner — *H. F. Harding* 362

The Nazi Speaker's Rhetoric — *Haig A. Bosmajian* 365

Politics and Religion in Colonial Fast and Thanksgiving Sermons, 1763-1783 — *Harry P. Kerr* 372

A Visitor's Notebook of Acting Classes in New York — *Jackson G. Barry* 383

Revivalist As Reformer—Implications of George D. Herron's Speaking — *H. R. Dieterich* 391

Saint Augustine and the Debate About a Christian Rhetoric — *James J. Murphy* 400

Bloomfield's Final Clusters — *James W. Abel* 411

Attitudinal Effects of Small Group Discussions — *Ray H. Simpson* 415

Joseph McKean: The Second Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory — *Paul E. Ried* 419

The Forum

Disclaimer Affidavit — *Frederick W. Haberman* 425

NEA and SAA — *J. Jeffery Auer* 427

SAA Conventions—1915-1960 — *Robert C. Jeffrey* 428

New Books in Review — *Robert G. Gunderson* 429

The Voter Decides — *H. F. Harding* 429

American Forum — *Norman W. Mattis* 433

Legacy of Suppression — *George P. Rice* 435

William Nast: Patriarch of German Methodism — *Paul H. Boase* 435

The Mind and Spirit of John Peter Altgeld — *Orville Hitchcock* 436

Susan B. Anthony — *Will Linkugel* 437

Impact: Essays on Ignorance and the Decline of American Civilization — *Marvin L. Seiger* 437

The Pastoral Art of Robert Frost *and* Human Values in the Poetry of Robert Frost — *Don Geiger* 438

E. E. Cummings: The Art of His Poetry — *Wallace A. Bacon* 439

Discussion, Conference, and Group Process — *James H. McBath* 439

A Picture History of the Cinema — *Henry L. Mueller* 440

Dictionary of American Slang — *Lee S. Hultzén* 440

The Pronunciation of American English *and* Phonetics: Theory and Application to Speech Improvement — *Elizabeth B. Carr* 441

Anatomy and Physiology of Speech — *A. T. Weaver* 442

Re-Establishing The Speech Profession — *Frances Lea McCurdy* 442

Recognition of Excellence. Working Papers of the Edgar Stern Family Fund — *Everett Hunt* 443

Briefly Noted 443

Books Received 447

Shop Talk — *Robert L. Scott* 449

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLVI DECEMBER 1960 NUMBER 4

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN 1960: A SYMPOSIUM PART II

CONTEST FOR THE PRESIDENCY

INTRODUCTION

PART I, "Contest for the Nomination," was published in the October issue. Both parts are a project of the SAA Subcommittee on Contemporary Address. Papers for Part II were arranged by N. Edd Miller, who has written the "Overview." The committee is issuing in mimeographed form a detailed campaign study, of which this symposium is a part. Copies may be had, free, from Paul H. Boase, Oberlin College.

The committee would appreciate expressions of opinions on the symposium. Letters can be directed to contributors or to The Forum. How can scholars in speech best contribute to such a study? What resources and techniques do we have that might make our contributions different from those of the political scientist, or of such general commentators as James Reston and Walter Lippmann? Is there too much concentration on the gaudy, national aspects, too little on the smaller units? How can we study the areas in which individual decisions seem to be most influenced, the homogeneous social group, and the economic interest group. These and other questions might be answered to the end that our studies be improved in the future.

Mr. Miller is Professor of Speech, University of Michigan. Mr. Kissel is Associate Professor of Speech, University of Texas. Mr. Harding, Professor of Speech, Ohio State University, began the election symposia when he was editor of QJS *in 1948. In the 1956 symposium he wrote on President Eisenhower.*

OVERVIEW

N. Edd Miller

It was inevitable that the campaigners for the Presidency in 1960 should draw parallels with the campaign of 1860. The shade of Abraham Lincoln was invoked by both major parties, and the Democratic candidate frequently used a 1960 modification of a Lincoln statement when he declared that "this *world* cannot exist half slave and half free." It should be noted, too, that 1960 was the centennial year of major party candidates' taking an active public role in the campaign—a practice initiated by Stephen A. Douglas in the campaign of 1860.

The 1960 campaign was further characterized by the youth of both candidates, by the widely-viewed television

confrontations, and for the first time, a campaign carried by one of the candidates (Nixon) to all *fifty* States of the Union.

The Issues

Of the many potential issues, only four emerged as real and were subjected to extensive treatment by both candidates. One issue was not publicly debated, but was of undoubted significance in the campaign. The four major issues around which real clash developed were in the areas of foreign policy (Quemoy-Matsu, Cuba, etc.), the status of American prestige abroad, economic conditions (future rates of economic growth, the present status of the economy, unemployment, etc.), and the relative experience of the two candidates for the Presidency. The submerged, but real issue centered around the religious affiliation of the Democratic candidate. This issue did not enter into the formal campaigning, although the Kennedy address to a group of protestant ministers in Houston was filmed and used in a number of places across the country. On the Republican side, the topic was not formally discussed, but the Norman Vincent Peale group's statement focused public attention on the issue.

Interestingly enough, some of the potential issues which in previous campaigns had developed into major campaign issues never really developed as central points of argument between the two candidates. In particular, civil rights and agricultural policy, though discussed by both candidates, did not have the same importance as in other recent campaigns. The presence of a number of foreign Communist and neutralist leaders in attendance at a U.N. Assembly meeting in New York during the early part of the campaign seemed to have little effect on the course of the campaign.

The Campaigners

The major load of the campaign was carried by the two nominees for the Presidency. Several other campaigners, however, should be mentioned as playing important roles.

Among the Republicans, vice-presidential nominee Henry Cabot Lodge proved a popular campaigner. Senator Barry Goldwater campaigned extensively, especially in the South. Governor Nelson Rockefeller made an unsuccessful effort to swing New York to the Republicans, and President Eisenhower, during the last two weeks of the campaign made several appearances for the Nixon ticket.

In the Democratic ranks, vice-presidential candidate Lyndon B. Johnson campaigned extensively and effectively through the South, with selected major speeches in other parts of the country. Ex-President Harry Truman campaigned vigorously for Kennedy (and became the subject of one of the interchanges in the third debate). Adlai Stevenson was a major Democratic campaigner, and worked zealously in California, where his popularity is high.

The "Great Debates"

Significantly, in almost every reference to the series of four radio and television "debates" quotation marks are put around the word "debate." In fact, these confrontations were closer to joint press conferences with sixty to seventy million auditors and viewers than to debates. The format did not permit any real debate to take place. Nevertheless, these were major incidents in the campaign. Robert Kennedy, Senator Kennedy's campaign manager, asserted after the election that the Kennedy performance in the debates was a major factor in his victory. He also indicated that the President-elect would prob-

ably be reluctant to engage in a similar debate four years from now, on the theory that the debates provide an advantage to the lesser-known of the two candidates.

Despite the fact that the so-called debates were not, in fact, debates, it should be mentioned that radio and television were used imaginatively (even if not with maximum effectiveness) in this campaign for the first time. In prior campaigns radio and television were used extensively but mainly as super public address systems to bring traditional campaigning to a larger number of people. The "debates" influenced the style and pattern of the campaigning. Nixon's election eve "telethon" is an example.

The Results

It is impossible to establish clear cause-effect relationships between what happens in a political campaign and the results of the election. Since a single event in a campaign probably influences the votes of relatively few people, it is impossible to say that a single speech or a single line of argument made much difference. For this reason, when the final results are very close, speculation about causes that influenced the results may be more enjoyable than profitable. In 1948, for example, many commentators credited the hard-hitting Truman whistle stop campaign with winning a close election, and there was a feeling that this style of campaigning made enough difference to influence the outcome. In 1960, it could well be that Robert Kennedy's view of the television debates is accurate. Perhaps the debates which were not debates ultimately won for Kennedy the important final decision by the judges—the voters.

RICHARD M. NIXON
Definition of an Image

Bernard C. Kissel

During the Republican National Convention in Chicago, July 28, 1960, the presidential nominee told his audience in his Acceptance Address that the campaign had started "as of now" and would extend into all fifty states. Convincing the electorate that the Republicans, the minority party, should be retained in office, was not an easy task. In order to win, the Republicans had to maintain party unity while appealing to a large number of Democrats and Independents. The *New York Times* predicted that this was the signal obstacle facing Richard Nixon since there were seven to eight million more professed Democrats than Republicans in 1960.[1] Nixon's convention remarks indicated that he was well aware of the task. Roscoe Drummond underscored this awareness early in the campaign when he reported, "Vice-President Nixon is estimating that he is beginning the race with the odds appreciably against him and is convinced that he faces an uncertain and up-hill battle."[2]

In the effort to convince the electorate to vote for Nixon and Lodge, Republican campaign strategy was to build to a peak the day before the election. The strategy included seven major factors: (1) three campaign tours; (2) four position papers disclosing Nixon's philoso-

[1] *New York Times*, July 17, 1960, Sec. 4, p. 1.

[2] *Christian Science Monitor*, August 24, 1960, p. 9.

phy on subjects crucial to the election; (3) four nationally televised debates; (4) six major addresses; (5) a number of nationally televised political rallies; (6) three televised personal reports; and (7) a four-hour question and answer telethon on the afternoon of November 7.

By means of this strategy, Nixon was able to disseminate his philosophy concerning the major issues of the campaign. His position was disclosed in the areas of social welfare, labor management, farm policy and water use, economic growth, defense and foreign policy, and experience. The last, which candidate was best equipped by experience to cope with the problems of peace and freedom throughout the world, became a theme of the campaign. The debates focused attention on several specific issues, such as Quemoy-Matsu, American prestige abroad, and Cuba. A real issue, Senator Kennedy's religion, was declared invalid by the Vice President. Two days after nomination he said he would "never talk about" religion, and directed his campaign staff also to shun the matter.[3] The major issues were voiced in the seven factors of the planned strategy, the base of which was, of course, the campaign tours.

For the tours, Nixon formulated a basic speech which was designed to stress several themes: (1) the issue of experience; (2) his identification with President Eisenhower; (3) the experience of his running mate, Henry Cabot Lodge; (4) the cost of the Democratic platform promises and where the money was to come from; (5) the manner in which America was ahead and would keep ahead of the Russians; (6) his opponent's immaturity and irresponsibility; and (7) private enterprise versus excessive federal control. These ideas were the foundation of the basic speech. He added pertinent information such as items arising from the four television debates. Stewart Alsop likened this basic speech to an accordion which could be expanded or contracted in the campaign, enabling Nixon to discard and substitute issues of immediate interest.[4] While the reporters became saturated with what they called the "speech," they reported its effectiveness. Joseph Alsop stated, "The Nixon speech is artful, emotional, packed with crowd appeal."[5] Reporters following the Vice President noted that "the basic speech always sounded fresh and cheerful at every stop."[6] The "accordion" speech was a definite campaign technique, planned to be adaptable to the electorate throughout the country.

A notable platform approach was adopted by Mr. Nixon at the various rallies and at the major speeches. Each appearance was well managed and carefully timed so that after local dignitaries seated on the platform were honored and incidental remarks were concluded, Nixon was introduced. He then approached the speaker's stand, often through the crowd, with his wife, Pat, on his arm, waving to the on-lookers. This became a hall-mark of his appearances.

On the first tour, begun on August 2 in Whittier, California, the starting point of each of Nixon's previous campaign efforts, he announced his intention of a "high road" campaign; the "high road" meant "discussing issues rather than questioning an opponent's motives." He offered the voter "total dedication to peace through service to man-

[3] *New York Times*, September 4, 1960, Sec. 4, p. 5.

[4] Stewart Alsop, "Campaigning with Nixon," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXXXIII (November 5, 1960), 32-33 ff.

[5] Joseph Alsop, *Washington Post*, October 3, 1960, p. A15.

[6] Stewart Alsop, *loc. cit.*

kind."[7] The purpose of the Nixon strategy was to appeal to Republicans, Independents, and Democrats. The party platform exemplified this appeal. Erwin Canham noted this factor, in the *Christian Science Monitor,* on August 3:

> It [the Republican Platform] is a position of moderate liberalism—of social reform under safeguards and brakes. It is a middle-ground position. Under normal circumstances, perhaps a substantial number of congressmen would support this position, especially including many Democrats. It may well have the support of the rank and file of organized labor, certainly of unorganized working men and women, and of the vast middle-ground majorities of the nation.[8]

This middle-of-the-road tone was undoubtedly designed to strengthen the Republican Party's chances of appealing to a wide segment of the electorate. The vice-presidential candidate further enhanced the bi-partisan approach of the strategy. The vice-presidential candidate, Lodge, recognized this appeal in a press conference:

> The non-partisan approval for my work in the United Nations which I have experienced in the past six days [on the campaign trail] has been extraordinarily interesting.[9]

In keeping with the strategy of the Republican Party, Nixon was cast in a mature and statesman-like image. In previous campaigns, Nixon had been pictured as a hard-hitting campaigner, a "hatchet man," "a man who went for the jugular."[10] Nixon's opposition in previous campaigns, candidates such as Jerry Voorhis, Helen Gahagan Douglas, Estes Kefauver, and Adlai Stevenson, had felt Nixon's invective and aggressive tactics. In 1956 a "new Nixon" had emerged in the campaign. He became a somewhat dignified and reserved campaigner. When he took the "high road" in 1960, and avoided what he called the "questioning of an opponent's motives," the mature, statesman-like image was accentuated. A commentator noted: "Observers who remember the Vice-President's toughness in previous campaigns could not fail to notice the moderation with which he opened this one."[11] This moderate approach was sustained for the better part of the three months although there was a greater amount of clash on the issues and a decided increase in tempo toward the latter part of the campaign. Meanwhile, Republican Party stalwarts voiced concern over a tendency to soften blows. Concern was particularly apparent after the first and second debates. There was pressure upon Nixon to become more aggressive. Consensus of this concern appeared in an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal:*

> For some reason, now unfathomable, Mr. Nixon blunted his sword. He passed up many opportunities to slash out at his opponent's fiscal program, to make the kind of case for economic liberty which he could have made, to sharpen the difference between responsibility and irresponsibility in the approach to questions of government.[12]

Nixon began stumping with moderation and, although he maintained a semblance of it throughout, he did not avoid direct clash on the issues, notably in the final weeks of the campaign. His strategy for a three-month campaign was to build to maintain momentum up to election day. He appeared to adhere to a course which would make the electorate aware that Mr. Lodge and he were the best qualified by experience and ability to fulfill the leadership roles and which would overcome the deep-seated

[7] *Los Angeles Times,* August 3, 1960, p. 1.
[8] Erwin Canham, *Christian Science Monitor,* August 15, 1960, p. 9.
[9] *Christian Science Monitor,* September 10, 1960, p. 1.
[10] *New York Times,* July 17, 1960, Sec. 4, p. 1.
[11] Kemmis Hendrick, *Christian Science Monitor,* August 3, 1960, p. 1.
[12] *Wall Street Journal,* November 2, 1960, p. 10.

MAX CHAMBERS LIBRARY

feeling of some voters that can be stated as, "I don't like Nixon, but I don't know why."

To inform the electorate, the campaign was divided into three tours. The first encompassed the month of August and the first two weeks of September and was calculated to present the dignified, experienced aura which the ticket wished to portray. He visited some fringe states, states which either did not have a high electoral vote, such as Hawaii and Nevada, or states which were almost certain to be highly partisan. He visited ten states and thirteen major cities. He also formulated, with the aid of an organization called Scholars for Nixon, a number of "position papers." These four papers were intended to disseminate Nixon's philosophy on the specific issues of *Communism in America, Our National Purpose, The Scientific Revolution,* and *Education.* During this tour, when Nixon's campaigning was interrupted by a knee injury suffered on the campaign trail, the papers filled the void somewhat in that they received wide distribution just prior to and during his hospitalization. The distribution included publication of the paper on "National Purpose" in *Life.*[13]

The second tour began on September 12 after the two-week hospital period and included, beside the normal coast-to-coast stumping, four nationally televised "great debates." In addition, this swing included the delivery of a number of major speeches concerned with six critical issues of the campaign. These three aspects, stumping, the debates, and major speeches, were the second phase.

Nixon began the first aspect, stumping, in a grand style. On the first day, September 12, he spoke in Baltimore, Indianapolis, Dallas, and San Francisco. In the first six days, he made a nine thousand mile tour in the Mid-West, South, and Far West. Although the tempo quickened, Nixon's basic strategy did not change. He concerned himself with subduing partisanship and reminded the audiences that "the people are to choose the man they feel best qualified to preserve peace without surrender; best able to expand freedom throughout the world. Too much is at stake in the world for a partisan, Republican answer to all this. The voters, all the voters, must decide which candidate is best able to make the big decisions, provide the leadership for the next four to eight years."[14] The focus of the campaign was on what Mr. Nixon felt was the one big issue, foreign policy in relation to the candidates' competence to cope with the problems of peace and freedom throughout the world. Nixon stressed this issue with the allusion that his opponent was too immature and inexperienced to handle the job.

The second aspect, the debates, started on September 26. Nixon, of course, hoped that the major issue of foreign policy would be the deciding factor. The format of these debates imposed a straight-jacket upon complete discussion of any of the crucial issues. A newsman would ask a question, the candidate would reply, and the opponent would comment upon the answer, making certain refutations or allegations. The candidate could not reply to those refutations, for the next newsman asked an entirely unrelated question. Therefore, the rebuttal of allegations became a part of Nixon's campaigning on the road as he was forced to answer charges and define his position which had become confused because of the general tone of the debates. Since free

[13] *Life,* XLIX (August 29, 1960), 87-94.

[14] *Christian Science Monitor,* September 13, 1960, p. 1.

discussion was not allowed in the format, several ramifications were elevated to the importance of major issues. Three of these were particularly important in the campaign: Quemoy-Matsu, American prestige, and Cuba.

The debates did offer the American public, however, the opportunity of viewing the candidates as they discussed, even though on general terms, the issues of the campaign. It was regrettable that the excellent opportunity for television exposure remained in the realm of generality and became a clash of personality and crowdsmanship. For the Republicans, the results were both good and bad. In the first debate, the personality of Mr. Nixon suffered somewhat. Strong lighting and poor make-up generated a stern and somber quality. On the positive side. Nixon did appear sincere, forceful, and knowledgeable in the presentation of his thoughts. In the last two debates, he was more penetrating in his attack on his opponent's stand in an attempt to overcome a "me-too-ism" that was generally prevalent in the first two debates. Nixon probably stated his case effectively but the projection of his personality did not overshadow that of Senator John F. Kennedy. The reverse may well have been the case. The importance of the personal image, with regard to the debates, may never be known. However, the *New York Times* conjectured, "There is reason to think that the election will turn less on what the nominees say than on how they say it."[15]

Overlapping the final two debates, Nixon in the third aspect of the second tour, detailed his philosophies on critical issues through major addresses delivered locally throughout the country. His policy pronouncements in these speeches beginning in mid-October covered separately these issues: (1) foreign affairs; (2) defense; (3) farm policy; (4) housing; (5) education; (6) the economy. He offered the public a comprehensive appraisal of his ideas in crucial areas such as New York City and Cincinnati.

The final phase of Nixon's campaign, based on his philosophy that votes can be changed up to and including the last day, included the inevitable big push. The Republicans had had a minimum of national radio and television coverage during the first two weeks of the campaign. In following this policy, they had avoided conflicting with coverage planned by the major networks on such shows as "Presidential Countdown," "Face the Nation," "Meet the Press," and the Huntley-Brinkley "Election Specials." In the final two weeks, however, in addition to stumping the six key states with a major share of the electoral votes, the Republican Party commenced its use of national network time with live rallies, and special addresses by Nixon, Lodge, President Eisenhower, Nelson Rockefeller and other Republican Party dignitaries. Nixon also introduced a series of three fifteen-minute, personal "home-side chats" in which he reviewed his stand on crucial issues in the campaign. The capstone of the mass media coverage was Nixon's appearance on the final day of the campaign on a four-hour national telethon in which he answered questions phoned to him.

This was the closest election in seventy-six years. The 1960 image of Richard Milhous Nixon appeared as that of an experienced, vigorous campaigner, who almost made it.

[15] *New York Times*, October 16, 1960, Sec. 4, p. 1.

JOHN F. KENNEDY
CAMPAIGNER

H. F. Harding

"Nature renders men eloquent under the influence of great interests or passions. An excited person sees things with a special eye. He can compare by metaphor. Without study he can make everything lively so that his listeners may partake of his enthusiasm." This is the way Voltaire describes Eloquence in his *Satirical Dictionary*. By this definition Senator Kennedy should have been eloquent throughout the 1960 presidential campaign. He was under the influence of a great passion (to become President); he was excited (as in the TV debates and during the last ten days of the campaign); and he certainly did try to make things lively (as in his attacks on Nixon and Eisenhower policies) so that his audience might come under the spell of his enthusiasm.

But was real eloquence by Voltaire's standards or any other's present? Did Kennedy reveal his true personality or the image his managers thought he should convey? Did he exemplify those qualities Professor Commager says a President should have—judgment, character, and courage? Did he display those essential qualities Aristotle says are so necessary for a political speaker—good sense, good moral character, and good will? These are the questions that the critics and the historians will ponder for some time.

THE SPEECHES

There seemed to be something missing in Kennedy's addresses from the time he "accepted" in Los Angeles to the last appearance on the eve of election. I generally found the *delivered* speeches (not the prepared texts) of the man who is now our leader short in substance, deficient in style, and humorless. This judgment, I realize, runs counter to the opinions of Professor Schlesinger the younger of Harvard and of Allan Nevins, the historian. Nevertheless, I thought Kennedy's arguments of his "basic speech" were repetitious, his examples and phrases monotonously the same, and his range of ideas disappointingly narrow. The man too often seemed to say what he believed the crowds wanted to hear. Of course, his opponent was no better. Nixon constantly worked in his "eight applause points."

I hold that the 1960 presidential campaign speeches were of low quality in invention, arrangement, style, and delivery. Unlike those of Adlai Stevenson in 1952 or those of F.D.R. in 1932 they will soon be forgotten. Meanwhile, the voters have been cheated out of their right to have the great issues competently explained. Kennedy failed to do—in 237 cities after 70,000 miles of travel—what he now has to do to become a great President.

Of course, the period from the conventions to the election is far too long. Hundreds of speeches inevitably make for thinness and decline of sustained interest. The TV shows which seemed to promise so much flopped as debates. The gross, overweening ambitions of both candidates ultimately made them pitiful rather than plausible performers. In short, both Nixon and Kennedy seriously underestimated the needs of the American voters. They threw mud, talked down, and confused when they

could have tried to illuminate and inspire.

The TV Debates

The four "great debates" aided Kennedy. They made him far better known, they broke down the charge of immaturity, they established him as a quick-witted ready speaker. True, both speakers did not always answer the questions. But Kennedy was at least as good as Nixon and often better in his replies. In retrospect, the candidates must have known that the questions they so unhesitatingly replied to could not be resolved in a couple of minutes by all white or all black answers. It would have been a relief to hear one speaker occasionally say he did not know a solution or that he would have to depend on qualified advisers.

The first TV debate made Kennedy a better than even contender. The second confirmed the relation. The third was probably a draw. The fourth was a slugging match of little credit to either candidate. A fifth contest would have been beyond endurance for many listeners. I am grateful for having been spared that final trial.

Some of the newspaper men who made up the panels were themselves superficial and arrogant. The pancake make-ups, the arrangements for lighting and temperature control, the "rules," the advance build-ups were as artificial as the two speakers. By and large the "great debates" of 1960 were fake and false. Let us pray we do not have to suffer them again in the same form.

The Voters and their Reactions

We are told the largest number of viewers in history witnessed the TV debates, more than sixty million persons. On other occasions during the campaign huge audiences heard the speakers over the networks and on their tours. Many voters made up their minds at convention time. But this year, more so than in 1956, many thousands were undecided voters—persons who waited to make a decision until the last few days of the campaign. And likewise, a great segment were silent voters, men and women who kept their intentions to themselves because Kennedy is a Catholic. We shall never know how many persons voted for Nixon solely to forestall a Catholic's becoming President. And we shall never know how many Republicans and Democrats voted for Kennedy solely because he was of their religion.

The TV debates gave Americans a first chance since the Lincoln-Douglas debates to compare the two candidates together by any set of standards they chose—personality, ability to discuss issues, or just plain appearances. And perhaps the importance of this last item is why Nixon worried so much about his perspiration when the studio was too warm. It may well be that such elements of personality as the smile, the youthful face, the glance of the eye, the hearty handshake, the flashing teeth, the vigorous wave of the arms, the speech pattern, the tousled hair—were deciding factors for the undecideds. The chances are good that many believed Kennedy possessed more of the attractive elements than the serious looking, heavy jowled, often scowling Nixon. We still have much to learn about why voters behave as they do once they enter the polling booth.

The Strategy

In 1956 when Kennedy lost the vice-presidential nomination at the convention to Estes Kefauver by 38½ votes, Robert Kennedy said he thought "we should forget the issues and send Christ-

mas cards next time." Nonetheless in 1960 the Kennedy managers made elaborate plans to travel, to discuss issues, and to capture the big city vote of ten large states. The fact that eight did vote for Kennedy is a tribute to the wisdom of this strategy and to the Democratic party organization. In New York City it delivered the vote and the next day split at the seams. Senator Johnson came through according to the script with 81 Southern electoral votes. Minority groups all performed as planned.

Teen-agers and women of all ages were Kennedy's most noisy and enthusiastic admirers. Reporters invented classifications. The standard category was the "jumper," but there were the "double leapers," women who jumped together while holding hands. Then there were the "clutchers," women who crossed their arms and hugged themselves and screamed: "He looked at me! He looked at me!" The elite were called "runners" because they chased the man and tried to kiss him.

Whether these adorers heard or analyzed what was said is certainly doubtful. They, like countless others, vaguely remember something about getting the country moving again. In fact, on rereading a few of the reported speeches one wonders whether the outcome would have been much different if both candidates had limited themselves to the TV "commercials" and the four TV debates. Inadequate as these appearances were they cast the mold of what the two men looked like. For millions nothing more seems to have mattered.

Conclusion

Nearly forty years ago the British scholar and former Ambassador to Washington, James Bryce, a keen student of American institutions, wrote (in *Modern Democracies,* II, 66): "That which most attracts the people is the thing we call a Strong Personality. They want a Man, some one who is to be more than a name or a bundle of estimable qualities, a living reality whom they can get to know, to whom they can attach themselves, with whom they can sympathize, whom they can follow because they trust his ability to lead. Courage and energy are accordingly the gifts that most attract them. Some measure of intellectual power, some cleverness and command of language, are required, for without these qualities no man could have got high enough to come into the running. But neither statesmanlike wisdom, nor eloquence, though often deemed the road to power in popular government, is essential."

These are the qualities which commend a man to the people, says Viscount Bryce. These are not the same qualities the parties look for when the party leaders search for a candidate. But Bryce's second list does not pertain. In 1960 the parties did not decide; the Kennedys had long ago selected Jack; they promoted him and built him up over four years; they waged and won bitter fights in the 1960 primaries; and they took the nomination from the "pros" hands down at Los Angeles.

The President-elect has amply demonstrated his courage and energy; he faced the clergymen of Houston forthrightly. He may not be eloquent. But he is clever and he does have a good vocabulary. Whether he posseses statesmanlike wisdom will take a little longer to decide. Does anyone now doubt that President-elect John F. Kennedy is a Strong Personality?

THE NAZI SPEAKER'S RHETORIC

Haig A. Bosmajian

AFTER his unsuccessful Munich putsch in 1923 and his subsequent imprisonment, Adolf Hitler decided that if he were going to attain power in Germany he would have to achieve it not through the use of violence alone, but through the parliamentary procedure which he detested. While he was imprisoned at Landsberg am Lech, Hitler declared: "When I resume active work, it will be necessary to pursue a new policy. Instead of working to achieve power by an armed coup, we shall have to hold our noses and enter the Reichstag against the Catholic and Marxist deputies." "Sooner or later," said Hitler, "we shall have a majority—and after that, Germany."[1]

To gain this majority, Hitler realized that he would have to persuade and influence a great number of German *Volk* and to do this he would have to use the spoken word. He wrote: "I know that men are won over less by the written word than by the spoken word, that every great movement on this earth owes its growth to great orators and not to great writers."[2] All during the *Kampfzeit* and the *Machtuebernahme*, the Nazi *Fuehrer* did his utmost to emphasize that the spoken word was more powerful than the written word in influencing, convincing, and moving the masses. Dr. Joseph Goebbels re-emphasized it and lesser Nazis followed the leaders and consistently echoed the superiority of the spoken word over the written word. Dr. Goebbels asked: Did Christ write books or did he preach? Did Mohammed write intellectual essays or did he go to the people and tell them what he wanted? When Lenin came from Zurich to Petersburg, did he go from the station to the study and write a book or did he not instead speak before thousands? It is Goebbels' conclusion that "there is no difference between the speaker and the politician. One can prove in history that the great politician was also a great speaker: Napoleon, Caesar, Alexander, Mussolini, Lenin, you can name whom you want."[3]

In the same vein, Franz Six, in his work on the political propaganda of the National Socialist Party, wrote that the French Revolution, as well as the Russian and the Fascist Revolutions, had been led by great speakers. Commented Six: "Danton, Marat, Lenin, and Mussolini and in their following the thousands of little fanatics have ruled the masses through the hate in their words and the passion in their criticism." According to Six, these leaders spoke to the people in order "to get them to move, to drive them forward, to whip them up to political action, to revolution."[4]

Hitler hypothesized that the French Revolution would never have come

Mr. Bosmajian is Instructor in Speech, University of Idaho. Material for this article is taken from his doctoral dissertation, "Rhetoric of the National Socialist Speakers," Stanford University, 1960.

1 Kurt Ludecke, *I Knew Hitler* (New York, 1938), pp. 234-235.

2 Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston, 1943), preface.

3 Joseph Goebbels, *Signale der neuen Zeit* (Muenchen: F. Eher, 1934), pp. 48-49. All translations from sources in German are mine.

4 Franz Six, *Die politische Propaganda der NSDAP im Kampf um die Macht* (Heidelberg: Druckerei Winter, 1936), p. 43.

about through philosophical theories if it had not been for the "army of agitators led by demagogues in the grand style, who whipped up the passions of the people tormented to begin with, until at last there occurred that terrible volcanic eruption which held all Europe rigid with fear."[5]

While recognizing the importance of the spoken word, the National Socialists looked back into German history for great German orators; they looked and found no great speakers in Germany's history, none of any great renown. Dr. Goebbels admitted freely that the German people never had the oratorical eloquence of the Latins. Germany, he stated, "produced many statesmen, poets, and scientists, but at all times lacked great oratorical talents."[6] Dr. G. Kurt Johannsen, Managing Director of the Hanse Press, complained that public speaking was completely neglected in the last century in Germany; the persuasive parts of speech were unknown, "with the result that public speeches had little effect." In German political life he finds no "Gladstone, no Joseph Chamberlain to arouse the people at election times."[7] Franx Six asserted: "Germany has in its more recent history no speakers who stepped out of the drawing room or club or later the parliament towards the masses of the *Volk*." Through Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist Party, contended Six, the spoken word "was raised to a valued and feared weapon of politics."[8]

Hans Krebs, the author of a small speech handbook recommended by the Nazis for beginning speakers, echoed the same contentions regarding the lack of great orators in German history:

> The art of speaking was rarely found among us Germans. Only few commanded the language and its means of expression to such an unlimited degree that it would have influence. Only with the National Socialist revolution did great orators and statesmen appear.[9]

Another book, *Rede und Redner* by Emil Dovifat, recommended by the select Nazi periodical *Der Hoheitstraeger* "to political leaders who already have gathered the practical experiences of a speaker,"[10] includes a chapter entitled "Speech and Speakers in Germany," in which the author asks: "Who talked in the nineteenth century, really and actually, to the times?" Dovifat answers his own question with, "Nobody." He writes: "The revolution of 1848 brought forth in Germany no speaker of political power like Mirabeau, no speaker of suggestive power of Danton, and no speaker of such natural behavior and effect as the Irish freedom fighter O'Connel [*sic*]." Dovifat admits that the nineteenth century was overflowing with a great amount of speaking, but it was all parliamentary speech which, writes Dovifat, "is not a call for *Sammlung*, but just the opposite, for explanation, for discussion. The speech of the party served . . . the group, never the whole. The public only took it as such and nothing more."

Discussing the lack of effective German speakers during World War I, Dovifat complains that "when Germany was thrown in 1914 into the most perilous struggle for existence in her history, even in that most fateful hour, no speaker appeared." As Dovifat saw it, France had her Clemenceau, Britain had her Lloyd-George, but Germany had no comparable speaker. But after World War I "came the young speakers of the new *Staatsfuehrung*, whose goal

[5] Hitler, *op. cit.*, p. 475.
[6] Joseph Goebbels, "Der Fuehrer als Redner," *Unser Wille und Weg* (April 1930), p. 76.
[7] Kurt Johannsen, "The Essence of 'Propaganda' in Germany," *Germany Speaks* (London, 1938), p. 121.
[8] Six, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
[9] Hans Krebs, *Redner-Fibel* (Leipzig: Theodor Herbert Fritsch, 1935), p. 5.
[10] *Der Hoheitstraeger* (September 1938), p. 40.

was to replace the parliamentary form of government with the *Fuehrerstaat.* Therefore, they had to be great, really great speakers." What made these young speakers so different, so great, so much more effective than previous German speakers? Dovifat answers: "From the beginning they spoke to all the *Volk,* and while doing this they molded a new form of speech; they created terror and rejection among those who up to now had cultivated speech only for certain groups, circles, and parties."[11] According to Dovifat, the rebirth of speech was brought about by speakers like Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini.

Recognizing the importance of the spoken word and also recognizing the need for effective speakers, the National Socialists brought into existence a speaker training program which trained various types of speakers for the different kinds of meetings which the Nazis conducted. This program was established by the Nazis during the *Kampfzeit* and was maintained after they came into power; by 1936, every *Gau* (the Nazis divided Germany up into thirty-nine *Gaue,* districts)[12] had some kind of speaker training program.[13]

Could one "learn" oratory? Could select Nazis be trained to be effective speakers? Kurt Rittweger, a Nazi orator himself, explained in his *Tagebuch* that one can learn to speak if one possesses the fanatical faith, for it is this faith which gives the "compulsion to speak." Further, wrote Rittweger, one must learn speech form and logic; "the knowledge of things is necessary, for every idea is a synthesis of faith and knowledge. But faith is the heart of every speech."[14] The Nazi monthly, *Unser Wille und Weg,* stated that it was possible to receive training in speech, "so that with diligence and patience one will be able to express his thoughts in a well formed way and in flowing speech." It was explained, however, that the "power of speech which can move people, make them enthusiastic, or touch them to passionate hate and struggle, this ability cannot be learned; one is born with it."[15] According to the author of the article, this inborn talent needs training.

"Can one learn oratory?" asked Hans Krebs in his speech handbook, *Redner-Fibel.* He answered:

> Surely, very great speakers owe their art to an inherent talent. They usually never "learned" to speak, but they are an exception. However, that which one calls a well organized speech, lecture, report, that is learnable to every reasonable and diligent man—if he has the firm will . . . and does not have a severe speech defect.[16]

Der Hoheitstraeger contended that oratory could be learned; "it does not come by itself." The speaker was told that "your word will become the deed if you have your information and the desire to communicate."[17] It was explained that "practice is everything" for the developing speaker.

The National Socialist speaker was told by Dovifat: "Speech is the most beautiful and most effective means of *Volksfuehrung* [national leadership]." From the outset of his book *Rede und Redner,* Dovifat asserts that speech is "the strongest force to awaken faith, to harden conviction, to destroy degeneration, to bring out new ideas, and to pull

[11] Emil Dovifat, *Rede und Redner* (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1937), pp. 8-14.

[12] *Gau-und Kreisverzeichnis der NSDAP* (Der Reichsorganisationleiter der NSDAP, 1938), pp. 15-20.

[13] Hugo Ringler, "Die Rednerschule und ihre Aufgaben," *Unser Wille und Weg* (October 1935), p. 332.

[14] Kurt Rittweger, *Der unbekannte Redner der Partei* (Muenchen: J. B. Lindl, 1939), p. 8.

[15] A. E. Frauenfeld, "Die Macht der Rede," *Unser Wille und Weg* (October 1937), p. 268.

[16] Krebs, *op. cit.,* p. 6.

[17] M. Weller, "Hinweise und Anregungen fuer den Redner," *Der Hoheitstraeger* (September 1944), pp. 21-23.

the masses from the old ways of thinking over to the streets of new hopes." When he speaks of "speech" he is not referring to *parlamentarische Rede,* nor to the *Parteirede,* nor to the *akademische Rede,* nor to the *forensische Rede,* nor to the *Predigt* (sermon). The *Parteirede* "served only the group, never the whole." The *akademische Rede,* he asserted, "isolated itself and was only directed to the circle of intellectuals." The *forensische Rede* "froze in the thorny thicket of legal paragraphs." Of the *Predigt* Dovifat simply said: "Let us be quiet about it."[18]

The Nazis had little use for *parlamentarische Rede* or for parliamentary government. Hitler's contempt for anything "parliamentary" was not lessened by his first visit to the Austrian Parliament when he was twenty years old. He describes the scene as "a wild gesticulating mass screaming all at once in every different key, presided over by a good-natured old uncle who was striving in the sweat of his brow to revive the dignity of the House by violently ringing his bell and alternating gentle reproofs with grave admonitions." Hitler couldn't help laughing at what he considered the low intellectual content of what the parliamentarians said and he found it difficult to understand their "babbling."[19] One National Socialist writer labeled the "parliamentary speaker" Ciceronian, "a speaker who never disappears, who flourishes in the high times of parliamentary *Palaver* (council of African natives)." On the other side, stood the Demosthenian speakers, "living incarnations of the *logos* of their nation," who "act out of a metaphysical mission, as speakers to their people."[20]

Complaining of the lack of effective speakers in Germany before the rise of the Nazis, the National Socialist Kurt Johannsen poured his scorn upon "academic" speech. Past German speakers, he contended, had taken the academic lecture as a model. Commenting on the type of speaking that was done before the Nazis came onto the scene, Johannsen wrote:

> To speak passionately and to carry the audience off its feet, so to speak, was called demagogy. Those speakers who were unable to gain a following called such speakers tub-thumpers. The polite speech thus became part of the regular programme, just like the reading of the minutes of a meeting. . . . The hearers congratulated each other when the address was not too oily and pathetic, and especially, when it was not too long.[21]

Goebbels considered the intellectual speaker, the "speaker from the mind," ineffective because such a speaker could only speak to people "who receive with the mind." This type of speaker, according to Goebbels, could only be instructive and "at the best, he is able to convince, but never able to mobilize the masses and get them to march, disregarding their personal advantages, and even under the acceptance of death and danger."[22] On January 9, 1928, Goebbels told his audience that "propaganda should not be intellectual, but popular. It is not the task of propaganda to discover spiritual revelations." Said he: "I do not go into the meeting hall to find intellectual revelations, but in order to transmit to others what I have realized to be right."[23]

The purpose of the Nazi speaker was to convince the German *Volk* that the National Socialist Weltanschauung was right for Germany. As the Nazis saw it, their struggle was for "right and freedom, for honor and socialism."[24] When

[18] Dovifat, *op. cit.,* pp. 7-8.
[19] Hitler, *op. cit.,* p. 77.
[20] Karl Kindt, *Der Fuehrer als Redner* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1934), p. 11.
[21] Johannsen, *op. cit.,* p. 121.
[22] Goebbels, "Der Fuehrer als Redner," p. 75.
[23] Goebbels, *Signale der neuen Zeit,* p. 47.
[24] Rittweger, *op. cit.,* p. 8.

the Nazi orator stood before his audience, he was to appeal, like Hitler, "not to the bad, but to the good instincts."[25] It was the Nazi orator's task to transmit his enthusiasm for, and faith in the National Socialist Weltanschauung to the listeners and make them faithful National Socialists.[26]

The Nazi speaker was told "the orator has only one goal: to be a political power and to lead to action."[27] It is the "action" or "deed" (*Tat*) which is the highest goal of speech, according to Dovifat. *Der Hoheitstraeger* pointed out that the speaker's word "will become the deed" if he has his information and the desire to communicate.[28] What remains after the speech is delivered, said Dovifat, "is the deed towards which the listener advances out of the conviction the speaker has hammered into him, out of the faith he has awakened in him." He placed three demands on the political speaker: (1) he has to recognize the fate of his people; (2) he has to stand always behind his word, ready for action; (3) he has to subject his own being and oratorical success to the welfare of the community. Demosthenes is used as an historical example of a speaker who meets these demands; Dovifat finds in Demosthenes the speaker who "had the secure, prophet-like, clear view to see what was necessary for his people." Furthermore, Demosthenes was never a dreamer, never an optimist, never an artist of the voice; instead he possessed a "stateman-like sense of reality." Demosthenes is portrayed as an orator who had a readiness for sacrifice and the deed: "When he called for the fight against Phillip, he fought against him in the first row, as at the battle of Chaeronea. In none of his great speeches is there one word that he did not confirm through the deed. . . . Thus, he fulfilled the second demand: Every one of his words was coupled with his personal readiness for sacrifice and the deed." Dovifat also saw in Demosthenes "the greatest virtue of the speaker": to let the rhetorical glory and success step into the background for the demands of political intelligence and common welfare. For example, "Although he called incessantly for resistance against Phillip, he was able to show modesty and reserve in moments when the political situation demanded it."[29]

The Nazi orator too was expected to stand behind his words, ready for action. He also was expected to subject his own being and oratorical success to the welfare of the National Socialist movement and Germany. He was told that "the speaker is the propagandist of the Idea, who sacrifices his time, strength, health, and material values for the movement. . . ."[30] The Nazi speaker was further reminded of his obligations:

> . . . the movement is not there to make propaganda for the speaker, but he is the most active propagandist for the movement. The moment the speaker steps to the stand, he must realize that he is then the representative and exponent of the movement. Therefore, he has to be, both in his personal life and public life, an example of a dutiful, industrious, and modest National Socialist.[31]

The Nazi speaker was told that he must consider himself the "fighter for a Weltanschauung which demands battle";[32] he was to be prepared for "wrestling with opponents in long debates and often times going home with bandaged head."[33]

After the *Machtuebernahme*, the Nazi

[25] Goebbels, "Der Fuehrer als Redner," p. 77.
[26] Goebbels, *Signale der neuen Zeit*, p. 47.
[27] Dovifat, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
[28] Weller, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
[29] Dovifat, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-21.
[30] G. Stark, *Moderne politische Propaganda* (Munich: Franz Eher, 1930), p. 18.
[31] Karl Protze, "Die Aufgabe des Redners in den kommenden Monaten," *Unser Wille und Weg* (October 1935), p. 333.
[32] Hugo Ringler, "Rednerausbildung," *Unser Wille und Weg* (July 1935), p. 222.
[33] Rittweger, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

speaker did not have to worry so much about going home with bandaged head; the opposition with which the National Socialist orator had to cope during the *Kampfzeit* no longer existed in the Third Reich. There was no more discussion, no more "calling from the audience, and above all, no more opposition to cause disturbances which would force the speaker to do his best."[34] In 1934, the speaker's task was made easier when, according to the New York *Times*, "Germany became a public speaker's paradise . . . with promulgation of an anti-heckling decree by Dr. Wilhelm Frick, Minister of Interior."[35] Dr. Frick ordered that only non-controversial questions could be asked after lectures. Audiences, he said, would be expected to cease all interruptions that were provocative of controversy.

The Nazi orators continued their oratorical activities up to the time the Third Reich was defeated. Less than one year before the collapse of the Nazi regime, *Der Hoheitstraeger* was giving suggestions on speech training to the Nazi speakers. They were told, among other things, that a speech was not a piece of writing and that the "introduction must be reserved, but powerful, the conclusion must be powerful, but *erlesen* [select]."[36] *Propagandisten-Fibel*, published early in the 1940's, reminded National Socialists that "the *Fuehrer* looks upon the well organized meeting as the most important and most valuable work of the Party."[37] This handbook, distributed only through the offices of the NSDAP, advised that "there should be no mass meeting without musical accompaniment," that the entrance of the flags must be done in a perfect military manner, and that a report about the meeting, about the expositions and the impression of the speaker must be made at once to the *Gaupropagandaleitung* (*Gau* propaganda office).

Late in 1942, Dr. Goebbels mobilized hundreds of Nazi speakers "to stump the country explaining away reverses in Africa and Russia and helping to bolster morale on the eve of Germany's gloomiest Christmas of the war."[38] Goebbels himself continued to address large audiences during the latter part of the war. On June 23, 1943, he spoke in Dortmund to an audience of 20,000 people who were, after he had completed his speech, "ready to go through fire for him and the Nazi cause."[39] On November 6, 1943, he spoke in the Great Hall of the City Hall in Hannover while thousands of people stood outside on the square to listen to his speech through loudspeakers. The "storm of approving applause" gave Goebbels the impression of "living not in the fifth year of the war, but in the first year of our seizure of power."[40] Goebbels felt that more speeches needed to be delivered during 1942 and 1943. He recorded in his diary on December 7, 1942: "We ought really to deliver speeches more frequently than hitherto."[41] On November 8, 1943, he wrote: "It is high time the Fuehrer delivers a long speech in public to instill courage in the German people."[42]

However, Goebbels could not win the war with speeches alone; early in 1944 the Russians were advancing across Poland toward Germany, and the Allies

[34] Hugo Ringler, "Herz oder Verstand," *Unser Wille und Weg* (August 1937), p. 245.
[35] New York *Times*, December 4, 1934, p. 1.
[36] Weller, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
[37] Franz Huber, *Propagandisten-Fibel* (Wels: Leitner & Co., n.d.), p. 46.
[38] New York *Times*, December 23, 1942, p. 3.
[39] Wilfred von Oven, *Mit Goebbels bis zum Ende* (Buenos Aires: Duerer-Verlag, 1950), p. 30.
[40] Joseph Goebbels, *The Goebbels Diaries*, trans. Louis P. Lochner (New York, 1948), p. 498.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 235.
[42] *Ibid.*, pp. 501-502.

launched their Normandy attack on June 6. On April 30, 1945, Adolf Hitler committed suicide, and on the following day Dr. Joseph Goebbels was also dead. The Nazi Weltanschauung had failed.

For twenty years the Nazi speakers had preached the National Socialist Weltanschauung to the German *Volk*. These were speakers who had been told that through speech they could awaken faith, harden convictions, destroy degeneration, bring out new ideas, and pull the masses from the old ways of thinking; these were speakers who had given their speeches to millions of Germans who listened through periods of inflation, depression, war preparation, and war. Some of those who listened to the Nazi orators felt that "here were people with only one thing foremost on their minds, for which they would risk their lives: Germany."[43] One listener felt, "The speaker's ideas were so thoroughly after my own heart, that he seemed, in fact, to be expressing my own thoughts and desires."[44] Others who listened to the Nazi speakers "went home deeply moved, thinking that if the aims and purposes outlined by the speaker were capable of achievement, then life would once more be worth living."[45]

[43] Theodore Abel, *Why Hitler Came Into Power* (New York, 1938), p. 117.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 118.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

POLITICS AND RELIGION IN COLONIAL FAST AND THANKSGIVING SERMONS, 1763-1783

Harry P. Kerr

MUCH of the oratory which enlisted and stimulated support for the American Revolution originated in colonial pulpits. In general, custom forbade sermons which ranged very far beyond purely religious considerations, but there were exceptions. One of the most significant of these occurred on days appointed especially for seeking God's forgiveness or expressing gratitude for divine blessings. This paper describes the leading characteristics of political sermons delivered on fast and thanksgiving days between 1763 and 1783, and explains their peculiar utility in marshaling support for the Whig cause.

1.

Colonial fast and thanksgiving days had evolved from objections to the large number of holydays which the Catholic Church celebrated at the time of the Reformation.[1] The Bible specified one day for worship of God, said protestants, but man had created so many others that the Sabbath was relegated to a place of secondary importance. The Church had designated more than a quarter of the weekdays of the year as fast days, and it had set aside nearly half of the year for festival time when church attendance was required under severe penalties.[2] When they gained sufficient power, protestants abolished such holydays by the score. Holinshed wrote that by the early years of the reign of Elizabeth I, "foure score and fifteene, called festiuall, and thirtie Profesti, besides the sundaies, . . are all brought vnto seauen and twentie."[3] Puritans, always thorough in revolt, initially abolished all holydays.

The reformers succeeded in restoring the Sabbath to its original pre-eminence, but in so doing they created a void which did not accord with their theological views. Most dissenters believed in God's Providence. They believed that God, to further his own purposes, intervened directly in men's affairs. Abundant harvests, the birth of a healthy child, a military debacle, a home ravished by fire—all were interpreted as manifestations of God's pleasure or displeasure with his people, and whether it warned or rewarded, God's voice should be acknowledged. Regular Sabbath services were not adequate to this purpose because God had sent a special sign. Special days were needed, and fast and thanksgiving days were created to satisfy this need. "And it is not only fit and reasonable, that we should associate and assemble together [on Sundays]," one Congregational minister explained to his parishioners, "but also, that upon some other times,

Mr. Kerr is Lecturer on Public Speaking, Harvard University.

1 William DeL. Love, *The Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England* (Boston, 1895), traces the development of these days through the nineteenth century in considerable detail. I am indebted to his account for much historical information.

2 Henry M. Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years as Seen in Its Literature* (New York, 1880), p. 26.

3 Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* (London, 1577; reprinted, London, 1807), I, 233.

we should socially agree and engage in this grateful employment, *especially* when the favourable providence of heaven gives us great occasion therefor."[4]

Early in the seventeenth century, dissenters acknowledged only special manifestations of Providence with fast and thanksgiving days, but man is a creature of habit. Love believes that annual celebration of a thanksgiving had become customary in New England by 1660, of a fast by 1695.[5] Special observances continued, however, and even the annual days commemorated specific, timely events whenever appropriate. On the annual thanksgiving of 1689, we find Cotton Mather discoursing on "the excellent things done by the great God, more generally in creation and redemption, . . but more particularly in the remarkable revolutions of Providence which are every where the matter of present observation." On a similar occasion sixty years later, Jonathan Mayhew singled out "the success of his Majesty's arms, and those of the King of Prussia."[6] Except for North Carolina, there is fragmentary evidence that special fasts and thanksgivings were observed from time to time in every colony, but the custom of annual observances was unknown outside of New England during the colonial period. The partial reversion to annual feasts however, did not modify the essential character of fasts and thanksgivings. When George III held sway in Britain, his American subjects still considered these days a response to some particular event.

Divine Providence presumably intervened in both religious and secular affairs, but droughts, epidemics, and prosperous business conditions were much more apparent to the community than the vicissitudes of an individual's spiritual life. Fast and thanksgiving sermons were, therefore, concerned with the secular consequences of wickedness and holiness more often than not. The title pages of published sermons are crowded with phrases like "a Publick Fast, After the Destruction of the Province Court-House by Fire," "a Day of publick Fasting, on Occasion of the Extream Drought," "the General Thanksgiving . . . for the extraordinary reviving Rains," and "a Public Thanksgiving, for the late Signal Successes granted to the British Arms."[7]

If fires, droughts, and military victories were appropriate subjects for fast and thanksgiving sermons, the precedent was sufficiently broad to permit ministers to discuss political questions when they became of interest. "Many who now hear me are witnesses," declared John Witherspoon, "that it has never been my practice, for reasons which appear to me to be good, to intermix politics with the ordinary service of the sanctuary, on the weekly returns of the christian sabbath, [but on fast and thanksgiving days] it becomes part of a minister's duty to direct the attention of the hearers to events of a public nature."[8] The way was opened for these sermons to function as an important medium of political

[4] Henry Cumings, *A Thanksgiving Sermon Preached at Billerica, November 27, 1766* (Boston, 1767), pp. 5-6.

[5] Love, pp. 248-249.

[6] Cotton Mather, *The Wonderful Works of God Commemorated* (Boston, 1690); Jonathan Mayhew, *Two Discourses Delivered November 23rd, 1758* (Boston [1758]). Quotations are from the title pages.

[7] Thomas Prentice, *The Vanity of Zeal for Fasts* (Boston, 1748); Aaron Smith, *Some Temporal Advantages in Keeping Covenant with God* (Boston, 1749); Thomas Prince, *The Natural and Moral Government and Agency of God* (Boston, 1749); Mather Byles, *A Sermon, Delivered March 6th 1760* (New-London, 1760).

[8] "Delivered at a Public Thanksgiving After Peace [December 13?, 1781]. Sermon 45." In *The Works of the Rev. John Witherspoon* (Philadelphia, 2nd ed., 1802), III, 62.

discussion during the Revolutionary period.

2.

The civil events which found their way into fast and thanksgiving pulpits resulted in sermons quite different from those usually delivered by ministers who chose to comment on political matters. Other occasions on which political questions were appropriate to sermons limited the scope of the preacher's remarks in one way or another. On election day, for example, ministers dealt chiefly with abstract principles of government. Military groups expected to hear about the propriety and necessity of self-defense. Commemorative addresses did not range far beyond matters connected directly with the event which they honored. These sermons were preached for a specific reason, but the reason was established by long tradition; it was the same reason year in, year out. The tradition of fast and thanksgiving sermons was precisely the opposite. They too were preached for a specific reason, but the reason stemmed from events of the hour; it was a different reason nearly every time. On fast and thanksgiving days, therefore, ministers felt that they could discuss specific aspects of the changing political scene in a way that would have been improper on other occasions.

Sermons preached on a thanksgiving in 1763 and a fast in 1766 illustrate this characteristic specificity and timeliness. The special thanksgiving of 1763[9] officially commemorated the end of the French and Indian War. At the same time, it foreshadowed, if not foreboded, the Revolution. James Lockwood reminded his hearers that the joyous prospect of peace brought with it the question of the "political Precautions that may be proper at this Juncture."[10] ". . . All discern the advantageous situation in which the happy conclusion of the war hath placed us," said East Apthorp.[11] The "advantageous situation" of the American colonies was the crux of the matter—at once a major result of the French and Indian War and a major cause of the Revolution. Twin specters of barbarous Indian attack and commercial strangulation by the French had hung over the colonies since their first settlement. During the recent war, their enemies had for a time seemed about to score a complete triumph. "Then, the arm of the Lord was made bear before the enemy," exclaimed Samuel Haven, "while the language of divine providence to us was, in a strain like that to Israel under the hand of Moses . . . 'stand still and see the salvation of God.' "[12] God had intervened, sweeping away the threat of aggression and bolstering the faith of the colonists in their military prowess. God's ministers used the thanksgiving day pulpit of 1763 to reinforce lessons of experience which would later be pointed to as proof of the colonists' ability to resist English troops.

Of those ministers whose sermons have been published, only English-born Jonathan Boucher, ever mindful of the interests of his native land, seems to have been much concerned with temporal obligations incurred during the war. He spoke at length of the great burden imposed on England by the struggle and insisted that *"for us and for our sakes* it was first entered into; and . . . our welfare has been principally

[9] Celebrated July 6 in Connecticut; August 9 in Pennsylvania; in Delaware, New York, and New Jersey; August 11 in Massachusetts and New Hampshire; and August 25 in Rhode Island.

[10] *A Sermon Preached at Wethersfield, July 6, 1763* (New Haven [1763]), p. 31.

[11] *The Felicity of the Times* (Boston, 1763), p. 7.

[12] *Joy and Salvation by Christ* (Portsmouth, N. H., 1763), p. 29.

consulted in the terms on which it has been concluded."[13]

England called unappreciative debtors to account in 1765. Amid the organization of groups calling themselves "Sons of Liberty," the signing of non-importation agreements, and the muffled tolling of bells, the Stamp Act went into effect on November first. One clergyman, David Sherman Rowland, likened the tax to a monster:

> So allarming and detestable was this *Hydra*, that its hiss, like an electric shock, instantaniously awakned a whole continent, and aroused its inhabitants with a noble ardour, to assert their just rights against the malignity of its poison.[14]

In Massachusetts, at least, and probably in other colonies, the royal governor effected indirect suppression of speech by refusing to proclaim a special fast day. In Connecticut, however, an atmosphere more friendly to the Whig cause prevailed. A special fast on December 18, 1765 was the occasion of a strongly worded sermon by Stephen Johnson.[15] He linked civil and ecclesiastical concern:

> The calamities which impend over us, and which we are now to deplore and deprecate, are the heaviest the churches and inhabitants of this land have ever felt, from any earthly power; and threaten . . . no less than slavery and ruin to this great people, in this widely extended continent.

The English were ruling as despots under the pretence of right and necessity. It was ever thus, Johnson continued:

> When royal prerogative is to be stretched and exalted to a boundless extent, to the enslaving of a nation, a loud cry must be set up "of the divine, hereditary, indefeasible right of kings, their dispensing power, and absolute supremacy above all laws, with the danger of monarchy from commonwealth principles, association plots," &c., &c.

When the Egyptians had attempted to rule Israel in this fashion, God's chosen people had won their independence, Johnson argued:

> Nor is this a singular and exempt case; but it has often happened, "that violent, arbitrary oppressions has drove the oppressed into that state of independency, which the oppressors feared, and the oppressed by no means desired." So it happened in the case of Rehoboam's oppression of the ten tribes. So also in the oppression of Holland, which brought on the revolution and independency of those high and mighty states: And it is possible, that, sooner or later, it may happen to the British colonies.

All this could be prevented by a wise administration in London, but ". . . if there be left to the colonies but this single, this dreadful alternative,—slavery or independency,—they will not want time to deliberate which to choose."[16] Johnson's was the only sermon published of the many delivered in Connecticut on December 18, 1765, but Love believes that many other preachers voiced similar ideas. He quotes from a manuscript sermon by Philemon Robbins of Branford: "Such as plead the kings prerogrative in acts unconstitutional and wrong are going apace to the doctrine of *passive obedience* and *non-resistance*, a doctrine held only by high flying [i.e., Anglican] churchmen."[17]

[13] Jonathan Boucher, "On the Peace in 1763," in *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution* (London, 1797), p. 43.

[14] David Sherman Rowland, *Divine Providence Illustrated and Improved* (Providence, R. I. [1766]), p. 11.

[15] [Stephen Johnson], *Some Important Observations, Occasioned by, and Adapted to, the Publick Fast* (Newport, R. I., 1766). The sermon was published anonymously, but it is generally believed to have been preached by Johnson at Old Lyme, Connecticut. See Alice M. Baldwin, *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution* (Durham, N. C., 1928), pp. 100-102; Philip Davidson, *Propaganda and the American Revolution 1763-1783* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1941), pp. 23, 159; Love, p. 330; Moses Coit Tyler, *The Literary History of the American Revolution* (New York, new printing, 1957), I, 101, note.

[16] Johnson, pp. 3-4, 14-15, 19, 20.

[17] Love, p. 331.

The most remarkable thing about these passages from Lockwood, Apthorp, Haven, Boucher, Rowland, Johnson, and Robbins is that they are so perfectly typical, not of pulpit addresses or ministerial speech, but of political speeches by any speaker of the period. Here are the same observations and sentiments one would expect to find in discussions at town meetings or the local public house, the same style and invention which characterized contemporary pamphlets and newspaper articles. Johnson's prediction of what would happen "if there be left to the colonies but this single, this dreadful alternative,—slavery or independency" is cut from the same cloth as Edmund Burke's warning to Commons and Patrick Henry's challenge to Burgesses in March, 1775. There is no special reserve in the remarks of these preachers, no bias, nothing save possibly an unusual number of Biblical figures, which identifies the speaker as a clergyman. Not every passage in the sermons resembles those quoted, of course, but similar passages occur in most fast and thanksgiving sermons. They demonstrate that ministers felt it was permissible on these occasions to forsake Christ—momentarily—for politics.

In so doing, they probably did not relinquish, in the estimate of most of their parishioners, those persuasive advantages which they enjoyed when discoursing on religious subjects. To the extent that they retained the image of ecclesiastics and avoided that of partisan politicians, preachers also retained their ethos as religious leaders and the authority to invoke religious sanctions in their arguments. These advantages were not lost very often. Published sermons indicate that ministers seldom forsook Christ for long, and even if the political enthusiasm of an occasional minister caused him to neglect his religious role, at least he retained an audience. Considered in this light, fast and thanksgiving sermons present the rare picture of men accepted as ecclesiastics but permitted to choose topics and language with almost the freedom accorded politicians. Those who wanted to manipulate the political thinking of a whole people could find in these occasions a vast, attentive audience which ministers addressed with authority on a wide variety of specific issues.

3.

The Whigs did not overlook this opportunity for mass persuasion. Whatever was said, discussion of political matters could hardly fail to arouse public interest, and it was indifference that patriot leaders feared far more than opposition. Whether ministers supported or attacked allegations of British tyranny, they could not fail to draw attention to Whig arguments. The unusual nature of fast and thanksgiving days set them apart from everyday events, moreover, and helped preachers make a particularly vivid impression on the minds of their listeners.

As suited a day of humiliation and repentance, fast day proclamations forbade servile labor and enjoined all citizens to pray, meditate, and listen to sermons. Most ministers conducted a single morning service and preached for about forty minutes, but perhaps a third of the churches still held to the seventeenth-century custom of double services. Members of these parishes attended church in both the morning and late afternoon and heard sermons of about forty minutes length each time.[18] A proclamation issued by the

[18] Of the 38 fast sermons considered in this study, 22 contain between 5,000 and 7,000 words. At 160 words per minute, they would require about 38 minutes for delivery. Five are long enough to have been double sermons, but there is no other evidence that they were

New York Committee of Safety in 1776 shows that few activities were allowed to detract from the chief business of the day:

> It is . . . expected that all the inhabitants of this City and County do, on the morrow [17 May], abstain from all and every kind of servile labour, business, and employment, and attend upon Divine service in publick, which will be performed in all the Churches in this City; that no persons (but such as are in the Continental service, whose business may require it) will be permitted to cross the ferries, ride or walk out of town, or about the streets, for amusement or diversion; and that all parents and masters will be careful to restrain their children and servants from playing and straggling about this City on the ensuing day, which ought to be, and we trust will be, kept as the most solemn day this devoted Continent ever held.[19]

There is ample evidence that such admonitions were not mere threats. Restriction of labor and recreation on fast days was required by the laws of Connecticut until 1833.[20] When legal pressures were inadequate, various quasi-legal groups imposed their will on ministers and parishioners alike. Eleazar Wheelock, apparently in good faith but nevertheless mistakenly, celebrated the annual thanksgiving of 1775 on November 16 at Hanover, New Hampshire, and was subsequently forced, very much against his will, to celebrate it again on November 30, the date designated by the New Hampshire Provincial Congress.[21] Asa Dunbar, Congregational minister at Salem, Massachusetts, failed to observe the fast on July 20, 1775 and found it necessary to publish a broadside declaring his "desire to live in good fellowship with every friend to *American* liberty." Apparently less independent of mind than his grandson, Henry Thoreau, Dunbar explained that his objection to the fast was entirely on religious grounds and appended the imprimatur of Benjamin Pierce, moderator of the Weston and Sudbury Committee of Correspondence.[22]

As the New York proclamation implies, even military personnel were required to observe fasts when their duties permitted. Washington's headquarters at Cambridge issued an order on March 6, 1776, for example, commanding observance of a fast,[23] and there are a number of extant sermons like the one preached by Charles Clay, an Anglican minister, to a Minuteman organization at Charlottesville, Virginia, on a fast in 1777.[24] Fast days, then, as William Gordon observed of a fast in Philadelphia in 1775, were usually very solemn occasions.[25] Thus set apart from customary occasions of pulpit address, fast

delivered in two parts. Ten are labeled as double sermons or there is other evidence to indicate this fact, and one is identified as the second half of a double sermon which was preached on two different texts. Ezra Sampson, *A Sermon Preached at Roxbury-Camp* (Watertown, Mass., 1775), p. 15 and note, refers to a sermon preached in the morning on *Hosea* IX. 12. The published sermon was based on II *Chronicles* XX. 11, 12. Sampson's remark, p. 25, "I fear I have trespassed *already* too long upon your patience," is but one of many indications that preachers heeded audience expectations as to the length of sermons. Similar remarks are in Nathaniel Appleton, *The Right Method of Addressing the Divine Majesty* (Boston, 1770), p. 59, and John Murray, *Nehemiah, or the Struggle for Liberty Never in Vain* (Newbury, Mass., 1779), p. 46.

[19] Peter Force, 4 *American Archives* (Washington, 1846), VI, 478-479.

[20] Jarvis M. Morse, *A Neglected Period of Connecticut's History, 1818-1850* (New Haven, 1933), quoted by J. Frederick Kelly, *Early Connecticut Meetinghouses* (New York, 1948), I, xxv.

[21] Wheelock, *Liberty of Conscience; or, No King but Christ in His Church* (Hartford [1776]), preface.

[22] Force, 4 *American Archives* (Washington, 1840), III, 675.

[23] *Ibid.*, V, 113-114.

[24] A portion of the unpublished manuscript is printed in William Meade, *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1857), II, 49-50.

[25] William Gordon, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Establishment of the Independence of the United States of America* (London, 1788), I, 371-373. Gordon also gives the substance of a pastoral letter issued by the united synod of New York and Philadelphia urging observance of the fast.

days not only provided ministers with an opportunity to speak on political matters, but also focused special attention on their remarks.

Thanksgivings did not afford the same degree of prominence to sermons as did fast days, but the minister's remarks were still an important part of a special day. Annual thanksgiving customs have not changed much since Revolutionary days. Colonists invited guests to their homes, enjoyed lavish meals, and generally celebrated in much the same manner as we do today. Special thanksgivings combined religious services and public celebrations. Both days apparently were celebrated with vigor. Sermons refer to "those, who have, this day, detained themselves from the house of God, to make provision for the regaling of our bodies,"[26] and to the importance of enjoying the day's "public rejoicings, and external tokens of joy . . . with all that decency & due decorum, which becomes those who have been in the house of God, this day."[27] Indeed, the propensity for celebration was so strong that it had, over the years, forced virtual abandonment of the earlier custom of double services. Only three of the sixty-one thanksgiving sermons considered in this study are identified as double sermons, and few others are long enough to suggest that they might have been delivered in two parts. The great majority of the sermons are 4,000 to 8,000 words long, normal length at that time.

The alacrity with which Whig propagandists seized opportunities to utilize the attention-getting values of fast and thanksgiving days is perhaps the best evidence of their usefulness. When liberal citizens of Williamsburg read of the Boston Port Bill in the *Virginia Gazette* (P&D) for May 19, 1774, for example, they sensed a chance to vitalize lagging public interest. There had not been a day of fasting and prayer in the Old Dominion since 1755. Hurriedly consulting Rushworth[28] "for the revolutionary precedents & forms of the Puritans of that day, preserved by him," wrote Jefferson, "we cooked up a resolution, somewhat modernizing their phrases, for appointing the 1st day of June, on which the Port bill was to commence, for a day of fasting, humiliation & prayer, to implore heaven to avert from us the evils of civil war, to inspire us with firmness in support of our rights, and to turn the hearts of the King & Parliament to moderation & justice."[29] The Virginia proclamation actually referred only to members of the House of Burgesses, requiring that they "attend in their places at the hour of ten in the forenoon, on the said first day of *June* next, in order to proceed with the Speaker and the mace to the church in this city." As George Mason wrote from Williamsburg, however, "the members would wish to see the example followed through the country; for which purpose the members, at their own private expense, are sending expresses with the resolve to their respective counties."[30] In Massachusetts the General Court's request for a fast day was refused by the knowledgeable Governor Thomas Gage. The purpose, said Gage, was only to give "an opportunity for Sedition to flow from the Pulpits," whereupon the legislature took

[26] Cumings, p. 32.

[27] Nathaniel Appleton, *A Thanksgiving Sermon on the Total Repeal of the Stamp-Act* (Boston, 1766), p. 30.

[28] John Rushworth, *Historical Collections.*

[29] Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. Paul L. Ford (New York, 1892), I, 9-10. Also see Robert D. Meade, *Patrick Henry* (Philadelphia and New York, 1957), pp. 303-304.

[30] Mason's letter is quoted by William Meade, *op. cit.*, I, 173-174. The proclamation is given also, but see Force, 4 *American Archives* (Washington, 1837), I, 350, for changes in the first draft. There is no evidence that the sermon delivered to the House of Burgesses by Thomas Prince was published.

matters into its own hands and recommended to the churches that they observe a fast on a day of their own choosing.[31]

From the religious viewpoint, drastic reduction of the great number of holydays formerly observed reasserted the primacy of the Lord's Day. From the civil viewpoint, comparative rarity enhanced the potential of fasts and thanksgivings as political forums; that is, rarity made them more troublesome to the Loyalists, more useful to the Whigs.

4.

Fast and thanksgiving sermons did more than merely draw attention to the patriots' cause. The sermons also furnished Whig leaders with an instrument for shifting attention from one question to another in a fashion consonant with their overall persuasive strategy. Manipulation of sermon content, and thereby of audience attention, was possible because of the strong bias we have already noted among church members toward acknowledging *special* manifestations of God's Providence on fast and thanksgiving days. To discover suitable sermon topics, ministers naturally looked to recent or impending events in their parish, colony, or country for signs from God. But spectacular events were (and are) rare in any one locality; and communication was poor within colonies, worse between them. Ministers already burdened with pastoral duties, moreover, frequently pursued some other activity to supplement a meager church salary. It is hardly surprising, then, to discover that these harried men were in the habit of consulting the proclamation of the day as a convenient source of topics for their sermons. "I have ever thought it expedient, on occasions of this kind," said John Murray on a thanksgiving in 1779, "to accommodate the services of the day to the *special* intent of its appointment."[32] Sometimes ministers incorporated the proclamation for the day into their sermon[33] or utilized a paraphrase as an introduction to their remarks.[34] Nearly always there was at least some reference to the "pertinent proclamation which enjoins the religious exercises of this day."[35]

Because colonial legislatures enjoyed the privilege of drafting fast day and thanksgiving day proclamations, the ministers' practice of basing their sermons on the bill of particulars in these documents presented the legislatures with a splendid opportunity to influence public opinion. On December 15, 1774, for example, a Massachusetts' proclamation invited attention to a single cause for thanksgiving: "the union which so remarkably prevails, not only in this province, but throughout the continent. . . ." Of the six ministers who preached this day and subsequently published their sermons, only Samuel Williams felt it was "not the business of the pulpit to determine measures of state." The other five preachers disagreed; not only did they discuss politics, but each stressed the advantages of colonial union. They urged their parishioners to thank God for the blessing represented by unity among the colonies and to avoid any

[31] *The Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with the Secretaries of State*, ed. Clarence E. Carter (New Haven, 1931), I, 356. Thaddeus Maccarty, *Reformation of Manners* (Boston, 1774), a sermon delivered in response to the request of the General Court, explains the circumstances, p. 34, note.

[32] Murray, p. 4.

[33] Joseph Montgomery, *A Sermon, Preached at Christiana Bridge and Newcastle* (Philadelphia, 1775), p. 8.

[34] Robert Smith, *The Obligations of the Confederate States* (Philadelphia, 1782), pp. 2-3.

[35] John Brown, *A Discourse Delivered on the Day of the Annual Provincial Thanksgiving* (Boston, 1771), p. 11.

acts or opinions which might disrupt it.[36]

If sermonic content could thus be influenced in a single province, why couldn't it be influenced in all? Once the Continental Congress had become a *de facto* national government, John Hancock lost little time proving that it could. At his suggestion Congress passed a resolution on June 7, 1775 (only twenty-eight days after it had convened at Philadelphia), recommending to the several colonies that Thursday, July 20, be observed as the first national fast. Congress asked that the people beseech God to preserve the unity of the colonies. It is worth noting that this resolution was the first congressional document to refer to the "Twelve United Colonies."[37] Judging from the sermons which were published, ministers fulfilled the legislators' hopes admirably. In Delaware, Joseph Montgomery took pains to insure that his parishioners in two remote hamlets fully appreciated the "grand assembly of the inhabitants of the continent," of which they were a part, when he said, "It must strike the most inattentive person with solemnity, when he considers that there is not, perhaps, less than two millions of intelligent Beings, this day, engaged in the same public acts of religious worship." Ezra Sampson preached to New England troops on the Roxbury hills above besieged Boston, overlooking the "*haughty* ships of war," and "the *ashes* of pleasant CHARLESTOWN," and "*yonder* never to be forgotten [Bunker] HILL." To these troops who had watched a Virginian take command of the Continental Army just seventeen days earlier, Sampson said:

> The trumpet has been blown, solemn assemblies have been called, & *such* a fast is proclaimed as *this* land never *before* saw.
>
> The peculiarly solemn day is *now* revolving, when humble confessions and fervent prayers from all the numerous societies and assemblies, throughout all these United Colonies, . . are ascending up to the *Lord of Saboath*.[38]

The importance of inducing residents of the various colonies to act in unison has been noted too frequently to require discussion here. Particularly during early stages of the Revolution, the conviction that colonists from New Hampshire to Georgia shared a common will to resist strengthened the resolve of all. Later in the war, careful wording of fast and thanksgiving proclamations by Sam Adams and others encouraged ministers to discuss subjects which leaders of the nation wanted brought before the public and to avoid subjects which it was expedient to forget.[39] This was not control, of course, but it was a very effective and useful influence which helped persuade dissenting ministers to shelve their often expressed suspicions and even hatred of the Catholic French and stress instead the benefits of a military alliance.

5.

Political sermons by ministers sympathetic to the Whigs stimulated interest and support. But what happened in

[36] Samuel Williams, *A Discourse on the Love of Our Country* (Salem, 1775), p. 27; Jonathan Bascom, *A Sermon Preached at Eastham* (Boston, 1775); William Gordon, *A Discourse Preached December 15th 1774* (Boston, 1775); John Lathrop, *A Discourse Preached December 15th 1774* (Boston, 1774); Joseph Lyman, *A Sermon Preached at Hatfield* (Boston, 1775); Isaac Story, *The Love of Our Country Recommended* (Boston, 1774).

[37] The proclamation is in John Wingate Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution* (Boston, reprinted 1876), p. 195. Gordon, II, 33, says this proclamation was the first government document to refer to "united" colonies.

[38] Montgomery, p. 7. Sampson, pp. 17, 16.

[39] Adams was a member, and probably chairman, of the committee which drafted the proclamation for a national thanksgiving on December 18, 1777; see [Franklin B. Hough], *Proclamations for Thanksgiving* (Albany, 1858), p. 4; Love, pp. 344, 400; John C. Miller, *Sam Adams Pioneer in Propaganda* (Boston, 1936), pp. 84-85.

areas where loyalist sentiment ran strong? What were the results of a fast or thanksgiving when Tory clergymen occupied the pulpit? The first observation to be made is that they *did* occupy the pulpit. It was better to preach than yield the sacred desk to a Whig. A substitute, said William Smith to his parishioners, "might not, perhaps, improve the present opportunity for leading your thoughts into that channel, in which I would wish them to flow at this trying time."[40] Accepting the challenge represented by Whig-inspired proclamations seemed to the Tories a better defence than burying their heads. From the pulpit they could direct the sermon along lines compatible with their own political sentiments and question the propriety "of a day of fasting, enjoined, not recommended, by persons of whose authority over us it has been our happiness till now to be ignorant."[41]

This tactic worked well enough in some cases, but there were pitfalls for the unlucky or unwary. If they urged their own views too strongly, Tory sympathizers ran the risk of retaliation by local groups of patriots. Jonathan Boucher retained his Maryland pulpit during part of the summer of 1775 only with the help of a brace of loaded pistols which rested on the cushion next to the Bible. He was finally forced to flee church and home as was John Agnew in Virginia.[42] If loyalists decided instead to take a moderate position, they could be made to appear Whig supporters. Boucher, a shrewd observer of Whig maneuvers, analyzed the difficult position in which he and other ministers of the Church of England found themselves:

> We were inextricably entrapped before we were well aware that a net had been spread for us. The minds of the people became unusually agitated: the times seemed big with some portentous event: . . . Some Clergymen indeed soon saw through the flimsy veil; but, thinking it neither wise nor safe to set themselves against the current of the times, as no particular services were prescribed, they judged it to be best upon the whole to attend their churches. They did this the more chearfully from a consciousness that it was at least in their power to avoid gratifying such of their hearers as were seditiously disposed with any inflammatory harrangues. For this conduct they were often insulted and persecuted by many of those loose and disorderly persons who had heretofore been the least respected in society, but who now became noisy, forward, and assuming. Too many of the Clergy of the Church of England, however, . . either not seeing, or not sufficiently regarding the consequences of any public deviation from the straight line of rectitude, fell into the snare: and when the pastor strayed, it was no wonder that the flock followed.[43]

Boucher was probably thinking of men like William Smith, Jacob Duche, and Thomas Coombe. All were Anglican clergymen residing in Philadelphia in 1775. Smith was particularly prominent as the first provost of the University of Pennsylvania and probably the leading official of the Church of England in his colony. All were loyal to Engand, and all eventually paid for their loyalty by being forced to leave Pennsylvania. Coombe and Duche fled Philadelphia in 1777 and spent their remaining years in England. Smith

[40] "A Fast Sermon Preached at All-Saints Church, in the County of Philadelphia, July 20, 1775," in *The Works of William Smith, D.D.* (Philadelphia, 1803), II, 116.

[41] Boucher, "On the Strife Between Abram and Lot" (probably preached May 1, 1774), *op. cit.*, p. 326. Also see Smith, *Works*, II, 116. Apparently there was very little objection to Whig proclamations among the laity; see Boucher, pp. xlvii and Maccarty, p. 34, note.

[42] Boucher's own story of his difficulties is in *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist 1738-1789*, ed. Jonathan Bouchier (Boston and New York, 1925), pp. 110 ff. For Agnew see George C. Mason, *Colonial Churches of Tidewater Virginia* (Richmond, 1945), p. 178, citing Dunn, *History of Nansemond County*, p. 41.

[43] Boucher, pp. xlvii-xlviii.

weathered the political storm in Maryland from 1779 to 1789, and returned to a distinguished career at the University of Pennsylvania, 1789-1803. In the summer of 1775, however, Smith, Duche, and Coombe preached political sermons which seemed to encourage the very course of action that led to the Declaration of Independence just a year later. Whig-controlled presses in America and liberal presses in England gave these sermons, particularly Smith's of June 23 and Duche's of July 7, wide distribution.[44]

Through a judicious combination of force and opportunism, men like Jefferson, Hancock, and Sam Adams thus helped to make fasts and thanksgivings occasions on which their friends could preach "sedition" and even their enemies found it awkward to register effective opposition. After all, as Boucher said, "what good man, or what faithful minister of God, could refuse to supplicate Heaven for the restoration of peace to a distracted land?"[45]

In sum, the rhetorical attributes of fast and thanksgiving sermons can be viewed as deriving chiefly from the protestant insistence that only a special manifestation of Divine Providence justified religious observances other than those ordained for the Sabbath. This prerequisite introduced mundane, and inevitably, political questions to the pulpit. It encouraged discussion of timely matters in specific terms. By limiting the number of such occasions, it enhanced their individual prominence. By pressing busy ministers to search out noteworthy events on which to discourse, it made the proclamation for the day the customary source of sermon topics. And this enabled legislators to influence sermon content. Finally, by creating a situation in which political considerations could affect the choice of topics on which church members expected their ministers to preach, it forced Tory sympathizers to make a choice they no doubt would have preferred to avoid, a choice between virtual support of the Whigs or abandonment of their pulpits.

These characteristics made fast and thanksgiving sermons a valuable addition to the Whigs' arsenal of persuasive weapons. More versatile in subject matter, more frequent and widespread in occurrence, and more easily subject to control, the sermons preached on these holydays were more effective instruments of mass persuasion than any other political sermons delivered during the period, and rank almost on a par with newspapers, pamphlets, and quasi-legal organizations as mainstays of the war of words which preceded and accompanied the American Revolution.

[44] Coombe, *A Sermon Preached before the Congregations of Christ and St. Peter's* (Philadelphia, 1775); Charles Evans, *American Bibliography* (reprinted New York, 1941), V, 112, says this sermon appeared serially in *The Maryland Gazette*, beginning on August 8, 1775; Duche, *The American Vine* (Philadelphia, 1775). Duche, *The Duty of Standing Fast in Our Spiritual and Temporal Liberties* (Philadelphia, 1775); Smith, *A Sermon on the Present Situation of American Affairs* (Philadelphia, 1775).

[45] *Op. cit.*, p. xlviii.

A VISITOR'S NOTEBOOK OF ACTING CLASSES IN NEW YORK

Jackson G. Barry

"It is safe to say that in New York there are more schools of acting than there are theatres," says Michael Redgrave, "for in no city in the world is there more craving for instruction."[1] The author of this remark is a widely traveled man and though "no city in the world" may be an actor's pardonable exaggeration, it is doubtful that investigation would prove him wrong. Certainly New York is a center of acting instruction, just as it is the center of the American professional theatre.

Right or wrong, the New York theatre person is apt to be narrowly provincial; no acting experience or training counts except that offered in his city. This attitude in itself makes an outsider want to see what goes on in New York acting classes, but there are other reasons for interest. The recent theatre boom has spawned a host of acting classes, calling attention to the teaching of this art, making one wonder what is good, what is bad, and what, if anything, is new. Popular fancy has been stirred by "The Method" largely through publicity on The Actors' Studio and a few of its more famous devotees.

All these considerations and a desire to compare my own teaching with like and unlike situations in New York led me all over the city to the places where actors gather for instruction—to schools, lofts, and rented rehearsal rooms. Through a period of two years, 1957 and 1958, I observed the classes. What follows is an account of some of these visits. It is an account of impressions, a factual report of what was seen. There is no attempt here to explain acting theories. Indeed, trying to impute particular theories to a teacher on the basis of directions and criticisms overheard in a few random classes would be grossly unfair.

The classes described have something in common. They have something in common also with classes by Harold Clurman, Lee Strasberg, Tamara Daykarhanova, etc. Popularly, all these would be known as "Method" classes (the catch phrase of the "Stanislavsky Method"). To the teachers themselves, however, "Method" is a crude and misleading term. Some even say, "Just refer to 'good acting' and 'bad acting,' not 'Method acting.'" Obviously in one's heart of hearts good acting is defined as the kind of acting one teaches.

We know there is a core of acting theory derived from the work of Stanislavsky. It came into the American scene through Boleslavski and others, was nurtured in the Group Theatre, and has been developed and changed through the years by individual teachers. Today *An Actor Prepares* could not, without modifications, fit as textbook for any given "Stanislavsky Method" class in New York, yet without this book and Stanislavsky's other writing and teach-

Mr. Barry is Instructor in Acting and Directing, Department of Theatre, Smith College.

[1]Michael Redgrave, *Mask or Face: Reflections in an Actor's Mirror* (London, 1958), p. 24.

MAX CHAMBERS LIBRARY

ing most acting classes would be very different.[2]

Of the many excellent teachers who might have been considered, the work of three was chosen: Sanford Meisner (The Neighborhood Playhouse), Herbert Berghof, and Walt Witcover. These men stand in the main line of American "Method" training stemming from the work of the Group Theatre. They give a variety of teaching situations from the full-time school to the single weekly class, and they were gracious enough to allow the author to audit their classes.

1.

Our first teaching situation, The Neighborhood Playhouse, gives the most extensive period of training: it nurtures its students in a full-time, two-year program before sending them into the Broadway market place. The Neighborhood Playhouse School of the Theatre, which was started in 1928, is a valuable by-product of Alice and Irene Lewisohn's original Neighborhood Playhouse. It operates its own pleasant five-story building on East 54th Street. Students undergo a thorough training that includes movement (taught by Martha Graham and Louis Horst among others) and speech. During this time they are not allowed to take any outside jobs, theatrical or otherwise. They are generally young (between eighteen and twenty-two), well-disciplined, and well-dressed, and arrive punctually for classes in clean, well-kept rooms.

For many years Neighborhood Playhouse training was dominated by the personality of Sanford Meisner, who in 1959, after twenty-three years as head of the dramatics department, turned the position over to David Pressman. Continuity, which was maintained by requiring that the two or three instructors who each year assisted Meisner had completed a course of training at the Playhouse, is assured; David Pressman was a student here and a former staff member.

The curriculum for acting is succinctly stated in the 1957-1958 catalogue:

> First Year. Fundamental training of the actor as a theatrical instrument, exercises in basic activity, concentration, imagination—applied individually and in groups. Second Year. Advanced technique. Interpretation; characterization applied in scenes and plays.

During the visits, first-year students were working under assistants on scenes which would be shown later for Mr. Meisner. Work on the scenes started with a reading by the students involved. All were two-person scenes from contemporary drama, running between five and ten minutes. The problems of each scene were discussed by the instructor, and the students were told to work up an improvisation based on the scene, which was to be prepared at home. The later presentation of these improvisations showed considerable élan. The students evidently had mastered in their four months at the Playhouse a form for setting up improvisations. Under the established pattern of the class, the work was done quickly and smoothly. The instructor checked the roll and called out the pairs of improvisors. As soon as one group finished, and while they were receiving their criticisms from the instructor, the next group set up.

The basic formula was as follows: One student in the classroom had set up some props to represent any place he might desire, and was occupied with an "independent activity," washing the floor, making a drawing, anything that involved physical activity which, for

[2] For a good recent account of the Stanislavsky Method by a man in the center of today's New York currents see Robert Lewis, *Method—or Madness?* (New York, 1958).

some imagined reason, he had to finish. The partner entered prepared with an "action" which he had to accomplish, as, for example, to persuade the actor in the room to seek a divorce, to invest in a theatre, to quit school. Obviously the person entering was the most "active" partner. Generally two improvisations were done to give each student a chance to initiate the action and also to develop an action when cast in the passive role.

One of the scenes being prepared was Scene I from Odets' *Waiting for Lefty* in which Edna pushes her husband to fight the corruption in his union. In the improvisation which would relate the actors to this scene the "wife" was "at home" and had chosen as her independent activity polishing a desk. Her "husband" entered with a bag of groceries. In all these improvisations and scenes, it should be noted, the props were real and were really used—that is, real groceries, real furniture polish, etc. The situation the two students had invented was that a meddlesome bully had moved in on them. The husband, who was afraid of the guest, took as his action, "to persuade his wife that they ought to move out." The wife wanted him to stand up to the visitor. This proved a very successful improvisation.

Some others were less so; they were not failures in terms of the plots invented but in terms of acting. The purpose of these improvisations, as the instructor remarked, was "To get comfortable in learning to work off the other person, to elicit and follow impulses, and to adjust." The importance of these exercises was in the moment when, propelled by whatever circumstances they had set for themselves, the students met each other face to face and had to create their stage life, without a script, out of spontaneous give and take.

The instructor made these criticisms. "You have an action, but you have to adjust. Imagine somebody died downstairs and you run up to the next apartment and pound on the door to ask to use the phone. But the person who opens the door stares at you. You would probably ask why he was staring at you rather than blurting right out that you wanted to use the phone.

"You don't follow a plan. You should feel free in the improvisation to go off in all kinds of directions according to what impulses may be stimulated in you by what your partner is doing and saying. Working off each other is *the* thing! It is the thing that you can clutch, the granite, the reality, the thing you can hold onto in every scene and improvisation. Your creativity is in your impulses. The worst the audience can say is, 'That wasn't the scene as written,' but they can't say, 'They weren't alive.' "

The criticism of another improvisation was, "You were relaxed and played off each other, but your relationship to each other was not clear in your minds. You need a heightened sense of relationship." To the young lady the instructor continued, "You don't leave yourself free to do anything. You come in, plunk yourself down and talk. Don't set a plan for what will happen. What freedom you had amounted to a quick verbal response, but not organic behavior."

At the opposite extreme two young men performed a rambunctious improvisation in which two roommates were getting on each other's nerves. The criticism was: "There is an overdirectness that destroys the truth. This room was supposed to be your home, where you live, and yet you did not come to *live* but rather to demand that the other actor make a scene with you. The bang-

ing on the piano seemed to be done merely for the sake of agitation. It had no simple truth about it. You were *demanding* contact from each other rather than living out what you had to do."

With the insights and the freedom gained through these improvisations the short scenes from contemporary plays were worked up in a period of about four weeks and presented in one grand showing before Mr. Meisner.

In the second-year curriculum students were also required to do improvisations on their scenes, at a more advanced level than the first-year, but the improvisations were done outside class time. These improvisations included work on emotional experience, "understanding why you want what you want," and building to a climax.

Under Mr. Meisner's direction, the second-year students were working on three one-act presentations to make up a major show case. They were rehearsing a cutting of *Billy Budd* (adapted by Coxe and Chapman from the Melville novel), Act II of *Love Passes By* by the Quinteros, and Horton Foote's *The Dancers*. Some of the director's comments while rehearsing these scenes well illustrate the acting philosophy of this school. In the beginning of *Love Passes By* the script contained many references to relaxation, the pleasant day, etc. This was not being played very well. Meisner made a comment that was frequently on his lips, "Don't play the text literally." He got the student actor to lie down on a cot in the room. "Make yourself as comfortable as you can. Do it for yourself. Give yourself time and let each moment happen. It is thoughtful, dreamy. You are lying on the beach having a wonderful time. The most important thing for the actor is *the life* not a lot of silly words."

The use and abuse of "preparation" is an interesting part of Meisner's work. An actor's "preparation" is a study made by the actor of the emotional state his character is supposed to be in and of how he can induce this state in himself. Typically the director got underway with, "Prepare and let's go." Of course the "preparation" employed to start one off on a scene had been done at greater length at home. If, for example, the actor was to be particularly joyful in a certain scene he would find something from his own life which, when he thought of it, would induce in him the desired state of joyfulness. Of the abuses of preparation Meisner spoke at a late rehearsal. "One thing that throws you is trying to hold onto your preparation. If you have the state [sadness to tears] fine, but if the crying peters out, let it. Go on playing one easy full moment after another and don't work for a result." Preparation was involved in characterization too, for the saying is, "*You* in a certain condition (for which you do your preparation)—that is the character."

On the walls of the large class-rehearsal room at the Neighborhood Playhouse were two signs which the students would long remember: "Don't think; act!" and, "An ounce of behavior is worth a pound of words."

2.

Herbert Berghof today has a new studio on Bank Street in Greenwich Village, but for several years his classes were taught on three floors of a loft building at 725 Sixth Avenue. The students at the Berghof Studio then gave a somewhat different impression from those of the Neighborhood Playhouse. They were generally a little older. Most of them held jobs of one kind or another, and they were more heterogeneous in background, theatrical and otherwise, than Playhouse students.

The program at the Berghof Studio consisted mainly of part-time classes, thirty-two out of the forty-six classes offered, scheduled for 5:30 P. M. or later. Generally a student took one two-hour class per week. In 1957 this cost $45 for the fifteen-week term. Besides Berghof, who taught six classes himself, the studio offered basic techniques courses with Anthony Mannino, and classes with Uta Hagen, Lee Grant, William Hickey, and William Alton. Classes in voice, speech, and body work were offered also. Admission to Berghof's classes was by interview, as they were scene-study classes and not for beginners. Even so, getting and holding onto a well-screened "advanced" class in New York is well nigh impossible and the talent and techniques of Berghof's students were widely mixed.

Herbert Berghof, who taught Ann Bancroft, Maureen Stapleton, and others, was born in Vienna in 1909[3] and was, by his own confession, a very technical actor before he came to "The Method." Today he attends the Actors' Studio and is fairly well known as a Stanislavsky actor and teacher. He is a good talker and his criticisms can, at times, become long and theoretical. These extemporaneous criticisms of scenes, however, constitute the total of the instruction offered in what might be called "case study" teaching. Naturally a certain reasonable number of scenes would tend to point up his major tenets, which he covers in amusing and graphic fashion as he expands on some hint to an actor.

The work proceeded by scenes, for the most part from contemporary plays. Berghof would read from cards left on his desk the name of the first scene and the actors ambled to the front of the class. While Mr. Berghof criticized the performance, the next pair of students would pull out the props they needed from the collection of second-hand furniture, bottles, and knickknacks hidden behind the curtains that screened off Sixth Avenue. The number of scenes performed in one two-hour class varied but probably averaged four.

A good deal of what Berghof said is eminently quotable, but since the attempt here is to show an approach to daily classroom problems, not a theory of acting, these samples are somewhat edited. The very touching scene that opens the third act of *Picnic* was done by two advanced students. In his comments to Rosemary, Berghof outlined a point that was often central to his criticisms. "You didn't create a physical life for yourself, in a *given* place, at a *given* time. Was it hot or cold? Were you tired? What had you eaten? You have to *create* the place and the objects in it. Make these real for yourself. Fill the objects you contact with so much importance that they completely occupy you. Remember, to act is to react to an imaginary subject, to react *really*, that is, the real true response to something I have made concrete and believable to myself."

He continued with another point: "This character is in a spot and she loses control of herself. She feels degraded to have to beg Howard to marry her. You, the actress, didn't get this and to get it you must use yourself and you can only use yourself in some imagined circumstance that is meaningful to *you*. At some time in your life you must have lost control. Use it! I have a thing about parades, particularly a Columbus Day parade. It makes me sad; so when I'm in a play and a character says to me, 'Your mother died,' I see the Columbus Day parade in my mind and get a lump in my throat. A technical help like that

[3] Daniel Blum, ed., *Theatre World: Season 1958-1959* (New York, 1959), p. 216.

can get you going and help you get involved in the scene."

An actor who had performed in a scene from *Nana* drew this criticism: "You are working too hard. You are not satisfied with simple involvements but are too busy 'expressing' and helping us to 'understand.' If you will pinpoint your attention, involve yourself, and learn how to function simply moment to moment, we will understand all right without your forcing it on us."

Work on "actions" came up in a scene from James T. Farrell's *Seventeen*. "How did you work on *wanting* to do all the things she is doing? Your actions are well figured out, but the need to do them is terribly weak; hence it is hard to hear you. You should make yourself feel that you just *have* to do whatever you set yourself as an action, otherwise you will continue to have a half animated body and half projected words."

Following these comments, made at greater length and with a good-hearted humor, the students took their scenes home and reworked them or started new scenes. Though exercises and scenes were done in the classes held by his wife, Uta Hagen, Herbert Berghof rarely did exercises in his own class. He did, however, treat the scenes as exercises, urging each of the students to bring in scenes often. "Don't hedge around, put off, and think about it. Bring in a scene! Not the greatest of the great, but a simple five-minute performance. Experiment and fail; experiment and fail. That's the way you learn."

3.

There are many young men and women in New York who believe they should teach acting. A surprising number have some ability for the task. Seemingly their appeal to students should be great, but commercialism is rampant and, not unnaturally, most unemployed actors want to study with a "big name" who may perhaps employ them. This does the unemployed teacher little good. But courage prevails among the unknown teachers, and new classes are formed yearly, sometimes monthly, and the struggle goes on.

Of the several better-than-average young teachers we might have looked in on, Walt Witcover was chosen. Witcover's teaching derives, for the most part, from his work with Lee Strasberg, though he has worked also with Stella Adler and has directed several productions for her. In 1957 he directed a notable production of Joyce's *Exiles* for the off-Broadway Renata Theatre.

In our visits we have proceeded from the school, to the studio employing eight or nine teachers, and now to the single class in a rented rehearsal room. The age of the students was about the same as at the Berghof Studio, about twenty-five. They generally had less previous training and beginners found their way into the class. The student turnover was large in these classes, as it was to an extent with Berghof also. Students drift in and out of such classes, and some of their résumés carry the names of four or five different acting teachers; the New York actor is notoriously itinerant in this respect.

Walt Witcover held his classes once a week from eight until eleven P.M., or until everyone had finished. The first half of the period was devoted to exercises. These had a more important place than in either of the other teaching situations observed. Of these exercises the most central to Witcover's scheme of teaching was "sense memory." This is a manifestation of the Strasberg technique. Neither Meisner nor Berghof stressed the sense memory exercise. Witcover's classes began with the students

one by one performing their sense memory exercises which had been prepared at home with and without real objects. The exercise might take the form of brushing the hair, drinking a cup of coffee, washing a frying pan. As the name implies, these exercises were done without props in an attempt to recreate by memory the sense impressions involved. To one seeing these exercises for the first time, they seem to be interminably long and at least faintly boring. The purpose, however, is not to entertain; they remain always exercises, not showpieces, and are sharply distinguished from pantomimes. When done correctly they give the student a sharp concentration and a heightened ability to make real for himself the imaginary surroundings of his stage life.

One student was very successful with a sense memory which involved pouring salt onto his hand, dipping his finger into the salt, and tasting it. He stood in front of the class for a wordless, motionless moment gathering his concentration and trying to see before him the imaginary object he was about to use. He reached out slowly and formed his fingers in air around the saltcellar which existed strongly in his mind but nowhere else. He lifted the saltcellar, again very slowly, pausing to establish the feel and the weight, the *sense* of it, in his mind, and through the mind to his fingers. This continued slowly while bringing his salty finger to his tongue (not really touching the tongue, of course).

At the end Witcover posed the usual question, "Well, what did you sense?"

"I got the feeling of the saltcellar in my hand and the taste of the salt on my tongue, but I didn't get the feeling of the salt pouring onto my hand."

"Did you get the graininess of the salt?"

"A little, but not fully and not all the time."

These exercises were considered so essential to the training process that Witcover at one point made a rule that no one could show a scene in class unless he had done a sense memory that evening.

Another exercise that Witcover gave to all new students was a nonsensical script. Two actors were given a paper which contained lines like the following:

"Well."

"Well, I'm here."

"So I see."

"Stop."

"Stop what?" . . . etc.

The trap set by this exercise usually tricked the student into giving imposed and contrived readings:

"Well???"

"Well, I'm *here!!*" and so forth.

Such readings ignored the real situation: two people in a classroom, each hearing disconnected phrases spoken to him and finding similar phrases written down to be spoken back. The correct approach to this exercise (realizing that "correct" and "incorrect" are relative in this field) is for the actors to relax and listen, following out freely any thoughts and impulses which the imposed situation might stimulate, but not to try to invent any imaginary situation or to try to color the line readings in any contrived way.

The instructor usually asked: "What thoughts occurred? Did you find out anything about your partner? Did anything *happen* to you?" There was no intention here to have the actor invent a character in which to play the little scene and answer the instructor's questions. "I thought the script was silly" was a more appropriate answer to "What did you think?" than "I thought I was in a prison camp being questioned by brain washers."

On rereadings of this set of dialogue, Witcover often added conditions such as telling partner A to write down as he read the script any impressions he got of partner B. Partner B was supposed to find out what A was doing.

These classes followed no set schedule but generally the latter half was devoted to showings of scenes. The first time a scene was brought in, it was read by the participants, usually a pair. Often the same criticisms which had been applied to the nonsense script were brought up at this time to keep the student from forcing a reading according to preconceived ideas rather than leaving himself open to listen and react. The regular practice at the Neighborhood Playhouse of bringing in one or more improvisations of a scene was not followed in Witcover's classes. In fact, improvisations on the scenes during class time were rare.

When the lines were learned and a rough blocking worked out, the scene was performed and discussed, sometimes with class participation, but always with summation by the instructor. As the actors dropped out of their roles and turned toward the class for criticism, Witcover would ask, "What did you work for?" "What specific goals did you set yourself for this performance?" In Witcover's criticisms one frequently heard: "Did you believe it? Did you make it real for yourself?" An essential part of the scene work here was to make specific and "real" to oneself the given circumstances of the scene. For instance, have a real person in mind for a character mentioned in the script but not actually present, make yourself feel hot if the atmosphere is hot, think of something which will make you angry if the script requires anger. Here the value of the sense memory work for the scene work becomes apparent.

Walt Witcover once summed up the difference between his work, which represents the Strasberg school, and the work of people like Stella Adler. "If, in a scene, there is supposed to be a fly on the wall, Stella Adler would work from the point of view of your 'action,' 'to hit the fly.' Lee Strasberg would work to make the fly so real to the actor that he gets the *impulse* to hit it."

The Neighborhood Playhouse, the Berghof Studio, and Walt Witcover do not represent a statistically accurate sample of Stanislavsky training in New York, nor do the three necessarily all agree with one another, though Herbert Berghof at one point taught at the Neighborhood Playhouse and Walt Witcover was once a student at the Berghof Studio and is presently teaching there. With an emphasis shifted here, a slight personality difference there, the sketches of classes given here might, however, portray many New York teachers of acting.

All over the city in studios, lofts, and living rooms "Method" improvisations are being done. "Truth," "impulses," "adjustments," "sense memory," "making it real for yourself," "involvement," "believability," are being hurled at actors by teachers, directors, or other actors. As with any technique there are a few people who use it deftly, with understanding and insight into the creative process, and many who apply it clumsily, blindly, by rote. Each of the teachers observed is adept in his own way. In this review justice has not been done to the philosophy of The Method, but since this is described elsewhere (in *Method—or Madness?*[4], for example) this close look at actual practice may have its value.

[4] See note 2.

REVIVALIST AS REFORMER—IMPLICATIONS OF GEORGE D. HERRON'S SPEAKING

H. R. Dieterich

A distinction of American social reform agitation has been its moral and religious overtones, voiced frequently by clergymen speaking from the pulpit and the lecture platform. The abolitionist crusade is an example of this connection between pulpit and reform. In a later day one may cite as additional evidence the Populist and Progressive movements, both of which were sparked by a moral fervor and a rhetoric that drew heavily on the evangelical tradition of American Christianity. Squarely in this tradition of American reform was George D. Herron (1862-1925), whose stormy career cut across much of the social agitation in the years between 1890 and 1920.[1]

1.

As a young Congregationalist minister in the nineties, Herron found a ready audience in the middle west for his fiery indictments of the existing economic and social order. At Iowa College (later Grinnell) as Professor of Applied Christianity, Herron helped to shape the social gospel movement within American Protestantism.[2] Concurrently he supported the Populists, Single-taxers and nonpartisan socialists in their attempts to reform society by secular means. Convinced that the competitive order of society was both an ethical and material failure, Herron preached the practicability and inevitability of an ideal society, the realization of a cooperative Kingdom of Heaven on earth.[3]

His outspoken criticisms of existing institutions led, in the late 1890's, to breaks with both organized Christianity and his college. Herron then took up the cause of the American socialist movement until, with the coming of World War I, he became disillusioned with the failure of this group to take a firm pro-war, anti-German stand. Finally, he saw Wilson and the League as the harbingers of the long-sought Kingdom of God on earth.[4] The failure of this cause also proved a tragic blow to Herron. He died in 1925, uncertain that his own devotion to reform efforts had been anything more than a series of "divine illusions."[5]

The evangelical optimism and fervor

Mr. Dieterich is Assistant Professor of American Studies, The University of Wyoming. He wrote his Ph.D. dissertation on "Patterns of Dissent: The Reform Ideas and Activities of George D. Herron," University of New Mexico. He is working on a biography of Herron.

[1] The most readily available summaries of Herron's activities and ideas are in Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York, 1949) and Howard Quint, *The Forging of American Socialism* (Columbia, S. C., 1953).

[2] Robert T. Handy, "George D. Herron and the Kingdom Movement," *Church History*, XIX (June 1950), 97-115, and also Handy's "George D. Herron and the Social Gospel in American Protestantism" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949).

[3] He developed his case at length in *The Call of the Cross* (New York, 1892), *The New Redemption* (New York, 1893), *The Christian Society* (New York, 1894), and *The Christian State* (New York, 1895).

[4] For his views on the war and Wilson, see *The Menace of Peace* (New York, 1917), *Germanism and the American Crusade* (New York, 1918), and *The Greater War* (New York, 1919).

[5] The phrase appears in a letter to a close friend, Louis Ferriere, March 14, 1925. Herron MSS, Personal Correspondence, I, Hoover Library, Stanford University.

that characterized Herron appeared in much of the reform agitation of his time. His sincere and powerful oratory convinced many of the need for and possibility of a more humane society. Eschewing the role of the active politician, Herron influenced his times through his abilities as a lecturer and writer. Despite a meager formal education (two years at Ripon Academy, Ripon, Wisconsin) he attained a national reputation in reform circles and was in constant demand as a platform speaker.

The polished performances which brought to Herron this reputation resulted, in part, from the care with which he prepared his speeches. He revised them meticulously, reading and rereading them aloud to catch just the right sound and meaning.[6] Whatever the occasion, he spoke from detailed notes, following them carefully.[7] Frequently a speech appeared, virtually unchanged, as an article or chapter in one of his books.

Herron understood his ultimate purpose: persuasion in a given social context. To this end he made full use of a strategy[8] that utilized most effectively both his religious frame of reference and his evangelical bent. Acutely aware of the non-verbal elements in a rhetorical situation, Herron, in the socialist fold at the time, advised his fellow reformers that to be effective they would have to Americanize Marx, and present socialism in terms of the American experience.[9] Regardless of doctrinal orthodoxy, he pointed out, the socialist appeal had to be clothed in a rhetoric in keeping with the aspirations and understanding of the audience—in this case the American working man.

In his public address, Herron frequently achieved the unity which marks the most effective rhetorical performance. This unity of speaker, address, and audience and the techniques relied upon by Herron to achieve it may be seen in two representative performances; they are signposts along his reform journey. On the first occasion, the speech launched Herron on his career in reform circles; the second came as Herron took up the cause of political socialism. Both speeches were published, widely circulated, and well publicized.[10] In each instance there is considerable information on the context of the performance. Using these data and a close textual analysis of each address, we may learn something of Herron's rhetorical strategy—what he said and why he spoke as he did.

2.

"The Message of Jesus to Men of Wealth"

The lecture-sermon which the twenty-eight year old pastor from Lake City, Minnesota, delivered to the Minnesota Congregational Club in Minneapolis on September 22, 1890, brought acclaim from the religious press as flashing with the "fire that is eternal."[11] The speech

[6] Mrs. Frieda Herron (his widow) in personal interview, March 1, 1957.

[7] Classroom and lecture platform notes may be seen in Herron MSS, Personal Correspondence, IV. For his avoidance of extemporaneous presentation, see H. Paul Douglas, "The Kingdom of God—A Resume of the Teachings of Professor George D. Herron, D.D.," *Our Day*, XIV (June 1895), 275.

[8] The word "strategy" is used here in the Burkeian sense to designate both a method and attitude; see Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (Baton Rouge, 1941), pp. 293-304.

[9] *The Day of Judgment* (Chicago, 1906), p. 25. This pamphlet expanded an earlier article by Herron, "The Social Opportunity," *The International Socialist Review*, IV (April 1904), 577-599.

[10] The speeches are noted briefly in Quint, *op. cit.*, but Professor Quint makes no attempt to place them in a rhetorical context.

[11] *The Christian Union*, XLII (December 11, 1890), 799. The complete address was printed in this issue and was published in booklet form, *The Message of Jesus to Men of Wealth* (New York, 1890). It is chapter four in Herron's *The Christian Society* (New York, 1894).

and its reception carried Herron to an associate pastorship in Burlington, Iowa. From this post he moved to the staff of Grinnell College and developed a nationwide reputation as a fearless and compelling critic of society. Herron's audience in Minneapolis must have known well depressions and mortgage foreclosures. If not farmers themselves, as businessmen and merchants they may have identified their interests with those of the farmer, concluding that eastern moneyed interests were systematically exploiting the West. Such feelings Herron crystalized into a religious crusade of good against evil, of the forces of a harmonious Kingdom of God on earth against the existing brutal competitive order.[12]

From the first Herron placed the audience on his side of the battle: "I assume in what I shall say that I am addressing an audience of Christ's disciples." He declared his was a twofold task: to outline the message of Jesus to men of wealth, and to apply this message to the problems of society. The importance of this message was manifest in the fact that whereas history and Biblical prophecy pointed to a time of peace and brotherhood, the day seemed still far away. Why? Because society was ruled by the "false and godless law of self-interest." The law of self-interest could be vanquished only by the message of Christ—the principle of self-sacrifice as the law of human development. For men of wealth, Herron asserted, the divine way of self-sacrifice had a particular application, for they had both greater opportunities and possessions to sacrifice. Herron cited Christ's sacrifice of himself in the service of man as an example of the law of self-sacrifice and then drew a parallel for his audience: "A man of business has no more right to make personal profit the supreme purpose of his store, his shop, his capital, his factory, his railway, than Jesus had to work miracles for personal profit."

Herron admitted that in an age which had "small sense of the divineness of things," this message was unpopular and irritating. It is always easier, he said, to "be obsequious" than to do the things Christ taught, "easier to subscribe to creeds and repeat rituals than renounce selfish ownership of one's possessions and deny one's self." Yet society could only be saved by those who would "pour their lives and possessions as streams of love and service into the great current of Christ's redeeming life, whose onflowing is healing the nations." The sermon closed on a call to action, as Herron urged his hearers to fall in step behind the cross; "God's new day of judgment is surely and swiftly dawning."

Herron offered a clear-cut choice. On one side was the law of self-interest, which asserted "the triumph of the brute man over the God-imaged man." He presented the evils of this principle in terms his audience could readily grasp:

> It is the law by which the New England deacon chattels his money upon the Dakota farmer's meager possessions at a usurious and impoverishing rate of interest—a deed which will not be obscured from the eyes of a just God by the endowment of a chair in a denominational college. It is the principle upon which the Chicago financier proceeds with no more moral justification than the highwayman's robbery of an express train, to "corner" the pork market and thus force from the hungry mouths of toiling families a million and a half dollars into his private treasury—a deed for which the

pp. 99-122, and appears in a recent anthology, *American Forum*, ed. Ernest J. Wrage and Barnet Baskerville (New York, 1960).

[12] The pattern of agrarian frustration—especially as it was reflected in Populist rhetoric—is shrewdly delineated by Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York, 1956), pp. 60-93. The recurring crusade imagery in Populist rhetoric is noted by Robert G. Gunderson, "The Calamity Howlers," *QJS*, XXVI (October 1940), 411.

> giving of some thousands to found city missions and orphans' homes will be no atonement in the reckoning of the God who judges the world in righteousness and not by the ethics of the stock exchange. . . .

Against this evil principle, Herron offered the principle of self-sacrifice as the law of human development and achievement. Every great reform, he said, has always "been won at unreckonable cost. . . . Every breath of our bodies and every opportunity of our hands, hearts and brains was bought for us with immeasurable sacrifice."

The decision was unescapable. The natural development of civilization could not furnish the answer, despite "assurances of a partisan press or the mercenary declamation of the politician who estimates the moral stupidity of the people by his own." Modern civilization was itself, Herron said, rooted in self-interest. Nor could the state afford an answer. "Laws cannot make men unselfish. They can restrain; but all legal righteousness is temporary." Abstract truth—economic, ethical, or theological—was no cure for the ills of society. "The Pharisees possessed the oracles of God. Yet the truth did not save them from greedy, heartless, malignant, hypocritical lives. . . . Truth that does not strike its roots in love is a curse."

Herron presented an emotionally airtight case. We are, he said, "deciding the destiny of the earth." The individual desiring to follow Jesus must grasp the fact that he has no moral right to live other than a sacrificial life. "There are no exemptions provided for stock exchanges, or wholesale establishments, or railway corporations, or social leaders, or politicians, or teachers of natural sciences." The speaker called his listeners to rally to the crusade: "Love of Christ is the mightiest power of the universe. . . . It is for this work that God would anoint you. . . . History has never presented to man an opportunity richer than yours."

The missionary and imperialist motifs present in nineteenth-century Protestant evangelicalism appeared in Herron's call. He told his listeners that as Christian businessmen, they could "give work to the wageless; teach the thriftless and ignorant; . . . be the heralds of a new civilization, the creators of a Christian industry whose peaceful processions will reach around the globe."

Herron combined the imagery of a crusade with Biblical language to close the sermon on an emotional peak. "New John the Baptists are arising who will speak truth and justice to the Herods of finance, though their ecclesiastical heads be the price of the message. . . . Behold the Lamb of God. . . . Let us close about Him, brother men, and keep step with the march of the cross!" To the listeners, it must have been apparent that their speaker was himself one of these new John the Baptists, speaking truth and justice "to the Herods of finance." Herron and his program had become one; accept one and acceptance of the other followed automatically.

The speaker's strategy seems clear. It is that of the revivalist calling for commitment to do battle with the forces of light against the powers of darkness. The ills of society appear united with Satan and ruled by the law of self-interest. Audience, speaker, and humanity are united with Christ under the banner of the law of self-sacrifice. Repetition and contrast draw the line more sharply between the opposing forces. Biblical allusion reinforces the case: "Cain's murder of his brother Abel was the first bold, brutal assertion of self-interest as the law of human life." Words such as "atheistic," "anarchy," and "nihilistic" are equated with the existing order. "Justice," "righteousness."

and "divine Christ-life" are terms that characterize the society ruled by the law of self-sacrifice.

The young minister liberally sprinkled his address with quotations from Ben Franklin, John Ruskin, Hegel, Milton, the English Christian socialist Frederick Maurice, and Bishop Frederick Huntington, a prominent reform figure of the time. These authorities are used to support and expand the contrast Herron presented and further they serve to establish the speaker in the eyes of his audience. In total impact the quotations lift the speaker from anonymity to the position of a man of learning.

The address stands as an exceptionally effective adjustment of ideas to audience and of audience to ideas.[13] Secular evils are translated into religious terminology and the audience is confronted with an emotionally charged, one-way decision. Such was the raw material that gave reform currents of the nineties their characteristic religious fervor.

3.

"Why I Am a Socialist"

Ten years later Herron again sounded a call to battle, but this time his cause was the socialist movement. The occasion was the formal opening of the Social Democratic Party's national campaign on September 29, 1900. Sharing the platform of Chicago's Central Music Hall with Eugene Debs, the party's presidential candidate, Herron himself was a figure of national prominence. A well-publicized resignation from Grinnell had increased his standing as a courageous reformer; as an independent lecturer, Herron was "responsible to no body of trustees—accountable only to the truth."[14] Following a short talk by Debs, Herron addressed an overflow audience of enthusiastic socialists in a speech which knit together such diverse strands as American individualism, Christian unity, socialist doctrine and party enthusiasm in so compelling a fashion that it shortly appeared as a campaign document.[15]

Nominally united under the socialist banner, Herron's audience was in fact seriously divided. The three factions represented by the Debs-Harriman presidential ticket included the Debs-led Social Democratic Party composed mostly of mid-westerners, a group of predominantly eastern socialists who had split away from the rigidly Marxian Socialist Labor Party, and various state Social Democratic Party organizations which staunchly maintained their own autonomy and independence. Following the nominating convention all groups endorsed a unified campaign, but factional differences boiled to the surface when the Debs group and the eastern socialists established rival campaign headquarters. Although the socialist rank and file gave evidence of cooperating in the campaign, there was in September an undercurrent of tension which could only hurt the chances of the ticket in the November election.[16] Out of the country at the time of the nominating convention, Herron stood apart from the factional difficulties. He had yet to align himself unequivocally with the

[13] This reciprocal relationship involving ideas and people has been noted by Donald C. Bryant as the essence of the rhetorical function. "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," *QJS*, XXXIX (December 1953), 413.

[14] Herron to Henry D. Lloyd, November 15, 1899. Lloyd MSS, Wisconsin State Historical Society.

[15] The occasion was reported in detail, with excerpts from Herron's speech, by *The Worker's Call* (Chicago), October 6, 1900. For the address in its entirety, see *Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 20* (Chicago, 1900) and a campaign pamphlet, "The Speeches of Eugene V. Debs and Professor George D. Herron Delivered at the Formal Opening of the National Campaign at Central Music Hall, Chicago, September 29, 1900" (Chicago, 1900).

[16] Ira Kipnis, *The American Socialist Movement, 1897-1912* (New York, 1952), pp. 83-100; Quint, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-364.

socialist party, and his stature as an independent reformer added considerable prestige to the speaker's platform.

Herron set the tone of his address by declaring that he had cut short a visit to the Holy Land to return and share in the trials of the American socialist movement. Socialism, he said, was in the "political melting-pot, being tried" and he was there to stay with it "until the Co-operative Commonwealth be established," or until his life was exhausted. The movement, which did not please him in all of its aspects (the rigid materialism of some socialists was well known), was yet to be coherently formulated. He had returned, however, to share in the "defeats and disgraces that are always involved in the first creative steps of an organized movement." Further disarming his audience, he recognized that he might not be "altogether pleasing to socialists" in some of his views; yet, he declared, he saw political socialism "as the only collective expression" of the things he had preached in the name of Christ. The socialist movement and not a particular party, Herron declared, was the important thing. It expressed politically "what was good and true in the democracy of our fathers." Taking the audience into his confidence, Herron asserted, that as a free man he could do nothing less than speak the whole truth as he saw it. He added: "If economic socialism means anything, it means just this liberty of every man to take a free look at life and all its problems and to be gladly heard by his comrades while he tells what he sees."

Herron noted three elements converging in American socialism. First were the "Socialist Labor people," whose proposition that the worker had to become aware of the class conflict and of the workings of the capitalistic system was indisputable. Extending an olive branch to the eastern Marxists, Herron cited them as people who had "spelled out their Marx in the hideous misery of sweatshops. . . . who pawned their threadbare coats to print their tracts." A second element stemmed from the individualism seen in the ideas of Jefferson, Rousseau, and the "genius of American political origins." This element contributed the ideas that liberty was a social achievement, that individualism could be fulfilled only in cooperation, and that no man could be free until all were free. The third element, said Herron, was a new religious movement, rising largely outside historic religious institutions and carrying a "much keener and more comprehensive spiritual consciousness in the common life." This, he added, was the route by which he had arrived at socialism; he outlined briefly the tenets of his inspiration.

He saw all material things as spiritual values, and the goal of history as the "liberty of each man to individualize God and nature and truth for himself and to live an original life of his own. . . ." This liberty could follow only "the passing away of the capitalistic form of society and the coming in of the free and co-operative state." The spiritual route to socialism carried an ethical obligation as well. Many have shared, Herron said, in an unearned labor product; "We must pay our debt to our brothers—contribute to the emancipation of labor from the unjust order which gives the product of millions to the profit of the few."

Whether or not his listeners accepted his three converging movements, Herron asserted there was no question that socialism in some form was inevitable: "We might just as well appoint a committee to sit down on the sun, to keep it from going on its way, as to attempt to obstruct the socialistic issue

[*sic*] of the capitalist mode of production and distribution." Competition and private industry no longer worked; he added, they ought not to work.

Turning to alternative political parties and their promise in the coming industrial crisis, Herron said that the attitude of the Republicans was so clear that they deserved no further discussion. The Democrats offered "somewhat intangible hints of social reform," but after an examination of their talk of anti-trust legislation ("childish as well as unhistoric . . . eighteenth-century phrases") Herron concluded that this party too was inadequate. The speaker capped his argument by observing that even if "free competition that never existed outside an economist's brain could really exist, the result would be again special privileges and monopoly." Socialism, however, offered a plan for a new order; it recognized the unity of mankind and declared that full liberty was impossible so long as "some people own that upon which all people depend."

Next Herron disposed of objections leveled at the socialist movement itself. To assert that socialism must await an improved human nature was, he said, like refusing to abolish the devil in order to preserve the job of saving people from him. To the allegation that people need more experience in liberty and administration for successful public ownership, he declared that nothing prepared people for responsibility except responsibility; furthermore, it was an immediate question of right versus wrong. Finally, the class consciousness of the socialist that offends some was not class hatred but a recognition that one class was living off another. This had to come before labor could achieve its freedom; improvement in its condition could not be handed down.

Herron pictured socialism as a conservative movement fulfilling the true ideals of order, liberty and property, and saving property from a system that denied its sacred nature. For the bulk of mankind, capitalism had already destroyed private property. Furthermore, socialism came as a religion that stood for the fulfilling of the law of love. "No matter how materialistic its origin, when socialism brings men together in a great purpose it soon begins to develop fidelity and tolerance and patience and good-will, and the noblest of human graces." As the religious aspect took shape, socialism would become a "spiritual passion," at last meeting successfully all the problems of the universe. The appeal is an evangelical one; the religious route to socialism is the route by which the speaker has arrived, and the movement is offered as a religion, expressing the things Herron has preached before in "the name of Christ." That the speaker has just returned from a journey to the Holy Land adds to the effect.

In tone and content, the address promotes internal socialist harmony and at the same time makes a bid for outside support. Socialism, and not a particular party, stands as the important thing; in the movement the values of Marxians, American individualists, and spiritual idealists are equally manifest. This idea appears overtly in Herron's three converging elements and the point underlies the entire performance. Marxian terminology ("comrades," "class-consciousness") is meshed with the individualism and mutualism of Jefferson and Rousseau. Herron offers the socialist movement as both a remedy for existing problems and, more importantly, a plan for the reorganization of society in accord with a divine purpose.

The speaker subordinates the economic principles of socialism to a set of humanitarian ideals that carry universal

appeal. He dismisses both major political parties as hopelessly inadequate in the face of the industrial crisis and then he disposes of prevailing objections to the socialist movement. The case concludes with the assertion that socialism is really a conservative force, saving liberty, order, and property from a system that denies the sacred nature of all three.

Omissions seem as significant a part of Herron's strategy as his statements. Party and candidates are not mentioned by name—a somewhat unusual practice in a speech which "formally opened" a presidential campaign. Nor are specific platform measures discussed. By transcending these specifics, no converts are lost and a wider appeal for support is made. In deference to the anti-clerical audience, the heavy Biblical imagery of the Minneapolis speech is modified, yet the movement is still presented and urged in terms of its fulfillment of religious ideals.

As the proponent of a minor party attempting to become a major one, Herron produced a speech that made rhetorical sense. The address surmounted factional difficulties with an evangelical call to rise above them with the speaker. Its broad, idealistic appeal offered a chance to gain more converts to the cause.

4.

What can be said of Herron as revivalist-reformer, taking these speeches as typical and generalizing from them? Both speeches appear as similar rhetorical responses to quite different situations. In the 1890 speech, the problem was to get a wide and amorphous group —the Christian community—to unite on Herron's law of self-sacrifice and to attack social evils. For the socialists of 1900, however, there was little need to provide either targets or rationale and Herron focused on uniting the group and attracting new members to it. In the earlier speech, the point was to isolate an evil in order to lead a stronger attack on it; in the later one, Herron's primary objective was to unite all in support of a concrete plan to attack and displace the evil already recognized. In each case the listeners confront a choice, phrased in moral terms, between the way to the promised society and the way to chaos and ruin.

Consistently, Herron's attitude toward his audience is positive. He neither harangues nor indicts his listeners. The forces of evil are referred to in the third person; the speaker uses first and second person to refer to the side of righteousness. By assuming that his audience is with him, Herron utilizes the age-old persuasive device of dividing the world into "we" and "they" categories. The technique reinforces the reduction of economic, social, and political questions to an either-or choice.

The cause each time is phrased in terms of a religious crusade. Herron speaks as a prophet leading the way to do battle for humanity and the Kingdom of God. He relies heavily on proof by contrast; first, the law of self-interest is put against the law of self-sacrifice, and later, the promise of socialism against the inadequacy of all other political movements. The issues appear in a religious framework, admirably suited to the personality and experience of the speaker. Herron piles emotion-packed images and language on either side of the dichotomy; the contrast becomes overwhelming, the decision for his audience, inevitable.

Other similarities mark the two speeches. The use of language tends to be figurative with a strong Biblical flavor; there are few words used analytically. Even in speaking to the socialists, Herron attempts no exact use of Marx-

ian terminology, and his interjection of socialist phrases exists as a gloss on the whole performance. In keeping with the strategy of revivalism the speaker relies on key emotional terms and symbols to heighten the contrast between the good and evil involved. The "Spiritual," "righteousness" and "self-sacrifice" appear with Christ on the side of the Kingdom of God; "militarism," "atheism," and "self-interest" are linked with Satan and the existing but doomed order.

In both instances, Herron's moral contrast is phrased in terms of the experience of his audience. The "Message of Jesus" and "Why I Am a Socialist" stand as successful rhetoric because the objective reality experienced by the audience and the subjective realities of the religious prophet reinforce each other. Herron's strategy of persuasion rested on intense personal conviction. As a consistent approach for the herald or prophet, such a method has its pitfalls. The speaker may lose touch with his audience in his efforts to express in strong and figurative terms that which appears to him as reality. Not always did Herron manage to avoid this but he did so successfully in these two speeches.

An appraisal of the consequences of Herron's rhetoric must be tentative. We are left no quantitative index of his persuasive efforts, but it was the Minneapolis speech and others like it that ignited the agrarian brush-fire called the Populist movement. Herron was not alone in urging that Christianity had social implications, but among the voices in the social gospel movement of the nineties his was one of the most important. The socialist movement, too, owed something to Herron and his rhetoric. Stressing the spiritual promise of socialism, Herron clothed dialectical materialism with the symbols of Protestant revivalism, and certainly the American socialist movement carried something of this with it in its early days. This group was also indebted to Herron for his attempts to Americanize its cause and its terminology. Assuredly Herron—the evangelist-turned-reformer—influenced many of the efforts to find a more humane social order for which he so zealously enlisted his considerable skill as a public speaker.

SAINT AUGUSTINE AND THE DEBATE ABOUT A CHRISTIAN RHETORIC

James J. Murphy

THE importance of Saint Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* to rhetorical history has long been recognized. Charles Sears Baldwin asserts the book "begins rhetoric anew" after centuries of sophistry.[1] Sister Therese Sullivan applauds it for returning to the *doctrina sana* of Cicero as a base for Christian preaching.[2] More recent studies find in the work "a Christian theory of literature"[3] or a foundation of medieval preaching theory.[4] Its influence is clearly visible, being copied or quoted by such writers as Rhabanus Maurus in the ninth century, Alain de Lille in the twelfth, Humbert of Romans in the thirteenth, and Robert of Basevorn in the fourteenth.[5]

Since Augustine's attitude toward the Second Sophistic is so clearly expressed,[6] there has been some tendency to regard his work as a mere attempt to rescue rhetoric from the taint of the sophistic. Indeed his firm espousal of a union between meaning and expression marks his rejection of the sophistic, as Baldwin has pointed out.

Nevertheless the attention paid to his later influence and to his rejection of the Second Sophistic may obscure Saint Augustine's role in providing an answer to a Christian dilemma of the fourth century. A brief survey of the Church's position during this period may illustrate the nature of the dilemma, and of Augustine's solution of it.

The Emperor Theodosius formally abolished paganism by decree in A.D. 342, seventeen years after the first ecumenical council at Nicea had outlined twenty canons for the government of the Church. With the exception of such lapses as that under Julian, the fourth century was marked by such gains that the converter of Saint Augustine, Ambrose of Milan (340-397), could refer to his age as Christian times, *christiana tempora*. As one historian says:

> Until the peace of the Church, the hostility of the public powers had weighed heavily on the life of the Christian community. On the day when it had definitely been removed we see the church coming forth, as it were, from a long winter, consolidating and developing her

Mr. Murphy is Assistant Professor of English, Princeton University. *This study will become part of a book Mr. Murphy is writing on the arts of discourse, 426-1416.*

1 Charles S. Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic* (New York, 1928), p. 51.

2 S. Aurelii Augustini, *De Doctrina Christiana liber quartus*, trans. Sister Therese Sullivan (Catholic University Patristic Studies, Vol. 23; Washington, D.C., 1930), p. 8.

3 Bernard Huppé, *Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry* (New York, 1959), p. v.

4 Dorothea Roth, *Die mittelalterliche Predigttheorie und das Manuale Curatorum des Johann Ulrich Surgant* (Basel, 1956).

5 Rhabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione* (J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* [*PL*] CVII, col. 294-420); Alain de Lille, *Summa de arte praedicatoria* [*PL*] CCX, col. 110-98); Humbert of Romans, *Treatise on Preaching*, trans. Dominican Students (Westminister, Md., 1951); Robert de Basevorn, *Forma praedicandi*, in Th.-M. Charland, *Artes praedicandi* (Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales d'Ottowa; Paris, 1936). This last work has been translated by Leopold Krul O.S.B. (M.A. Thesis, Cornell University, 1950).

6 *E.g.*, *De Doctrina Christiana* IV.v.7 and IV.xxviii.61, *De catechizandis rudibus* 9, and *Confessions* IX.ii.4. Note also the careful discussion of the utility of pleasure in *De Doctrina* IV.xxv.55-58, where pleasure is made to serve the purpose of persuasion.

ranks, discussing her hierarchal powers, defining the lines of her doctrines, drawing up the formulae of her faith, regulating her worship, surrounding the holy places with public marks of veneration, providing holy retreats for souls desirous of perfection, and giving to the Latin half of the Church a more faithful version of the Bible. All these fruits are the harvest of the fourth century.[7]

The century was therefore one for many decisions. During the lifetime of Augustine, for instance, the Church faced the heresies of Manichæans, Pelagians, Donatists, and Priscillianists. But besides the problems of defining Christian doctrines in reply to heretical attacks, the Christian community faced another problem of almost equal magnitude—the problem of defining the intellectual base for a culture which would permit the Church to perform its duty of leading men to salvation. This was a matter of the greatest moment, for upon its success depended the training of future apologists to defend doctrine against heresy, the formation of future poets to carry the Word of God to the people through literature, and the very education of the people themselves.

The basic issue was whether the Church should adopt in toto the contemporary culture which Rome had taken over from Greece. The fate of rhetoric, as a part of the Greco-Roman culture, was involved not only in the debate over the larger issue, but in more limited controversies about its own merits. Indeed, the contrast between *Verbum* (Word of God) and *verbum* (word of man) was stressed from the very beginnings of the Church,[8] long before the broader cultural issue was joined.

Ecclesiastical leaders of the fourth century continued the debate begun more than a century earlier when the conversion of many writers, poets, orators, and other public figures had at last given the Church a corps of well-equipped apologists. From the first, some individuals reacted violently to their former pagan culture; Lactantius speaks of pagan literature as "sweets which contain poison";[9] Arnobius, converted in his old age, tried to show his new fervor by writing a book which among other things tried to show that even the old grammar was no longer necessary:

> Or how is the truth of a statement diminished if an error is made in number or case, in preposition, particle, or conjunction?[10]

Cyprian, who had been a teacher of rhetoric at Carthage when he was converted, renounced profane letters completely and for the rest of his life never again quoted a pagan poet, rhetorician, or orator.[11]

Titian rails against literature in general and rhetoric in particular:

> You have invented rhetoric for injustice and calumny . . . . you have invented poetry to sing of battles, the loves of the gods, of everything which corrupts the spirit.[12]

[7] M. Paul Lejay, quoted in Pierre DeLabriolle, *The History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius* (New York, 1924), p. 231.

[8] St. Paul, for instance, said: "And my speech and my preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in the showing of the Spirit and the Power" (I Cor. 2:3-4). Virtually every early Christian writer stresses the difference between *sapientia huius saeculi* and *sapientia spiritualis*. John of Antioch, for instance, declares in his sermon *On the Heroes of the Faith:* "But the Cross wrought persuasion by means of unlearned men; yea, it persuaded even the whole world."

[9] Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* [*CSEL*, XIX]), 400.4.

[10] Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* (*CSEL*, IV), I.59. Arnobius helped make a watchword of a phrase of Saint Paul: "The wisdom of man is foolishness before God" (I Cor. 3:19).

[11] Gustave Bardy, "L'église et l'enseignment pendant les trois premiers siecles," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, XII (1932), 1-28. The awful magnitude of this renunciation may easily be overlooked by a modern reader who does not recall the pervasiveness of teaching through *imitatio* in Roman schools.

[12] Titian, *Oratio* 1-3, quoted in Gustave Combès, *Saint Augustin et la culture classique* (Paris, 1927), p. 88.

Justin warns against venerating unduly words (i.e., literature) which are not from God.[13] Clement of Alexandria points out that this revulsion against the old order was not limited to the intellectual classes: "The common herd fear Greek philosophy just as children fear goblins."[14]

Tertullian directs an attack against Greek philosophy and other pagan writings. "Where is there any likeness between the Christian and the philosopher?" he asks in his defense of pure faith, and terms philosophers "patriarchs of heresy." In a famous passage in his *De præscriptione haæreticorum* he outlines the problem as many of his contemporaries saw it:

> What indeed has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What concord is there between the Academy and the church? What between heretics and Christians?[15]

The necessity for education posed a dilemma to Tertullian, who realized that it would be foolhardy to espouse ignorance, but who declared also that it was not licit for Christians to teach literature because it dealt with false gods.[16]

Similar remarks may be found in the writings of Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Synesius of Cyrene, and the historian Socrates. As Labriolle observes: "There emerges, therefore, the fact that we can state that during the first centuries of the Empire there is hardly a Christian writer in whose case there does not intrude or show itself more or less sincerely, more or less diplomatically, a hostility in some regard to the different forms of pagan learning."[17] Nor was this antipathy short-lived, for even while Augustine was engaged in writing the first books of *De Doctrina,* the fourth Council of Carthage (398) forbade bishops to read *libros gentilium* unless necessary.

From the Christian point of view there were many reasons for such attitudes. Even if Rome had not been the Rome of persecutions with their awful memories, its literature was studded with man-like gods parading what some Christian writers saw as a virtual gallery of sins. What is the use of decrees against sin, Augustine asks, when the adulteries of even Jove are portrayed by actors, painters, writers, reciters, and singers?[18] Referring in scathing tones to the fables of the pagan gods, Minucius Felix points out that men even study how to improve on such tales, "especially in the works of the poets, who have had such fatal influence in injuring the cause of truth." He adds that Plato was wise to exclude Homer from his ideal republic, for giving the gods a place in the affairs of men, and then asks: "Why should I mention Mars and Venus caught in adultery, or Jupiter's passion for Ganymedes, hallowed in Heaven? Such stories are but precedents and sanctions for men's vices."[19] At best, secular education would divert the attention of the devout toward earthly things rather than spiritual matters. And since heretics often used logical argument to attack the doctrines of the Church, there was a cor-

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Labriolle, p. 17.

[15] Tertullian, *De praescriptione (PL* II, col. 20a-b), 7. Centuries later Gregory the Great, reproving a clerk who taught classical literature to his classes, expressed a similar view: "The same mouth singeth not the praises of Jove and the praises of Christ." R. L. Poole, *Illustrations in the History of Medieval Thought* (London, 1884), p. 8.

[16] For a survey of Tertullian's views on these related subjects, see Gerard L. Ellspermann, *The Attitude of the Early Christian Latin Writers toward Pagan Literature and Learning* (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. 82; Washington, D.C., 1949), pp. 23-42.

[17] Labriolle, p. 18.

[18] Augustine, *Epistle* XCI, in *Select Letters of Saint Augustine,* trans. James H. Baxter (Loeb Classical Library; London, 1930), p. 159.

[19] Minucius Felix, *Octavius,* trans. Gerald H. Rendall (Loeb Classical Library; London, 1953), xxiv.2.7.

responding tendency to fall back upon fideism (e.g., Tertullian: *regula fidei*) and decry reasoning itself. Hilary of Poitiers, for instance, states that truth is impervious to "marvelous devices of perverted ingenuity" in Arian logic.[20]

Another aspect of Greco-Roman culture which drew fire was the rhetorical excess of the Second Sophistic. Moreover, the rhetorician Fronto had been an early opponent of the Church, Minucius Felix notes. Although attacks upon rhetoric had an ancient tradition, the Christian writer often saw in rhetoric of his time the taint of a worldly, pagan culture which could lead men away from God. It is in this light that Gregory Naziensus reproves Gregory of Nyssa for abandoning Christian books to take up the trade of rhetorician.[21] Augustine himself was, in a certain sense, converted from rhetoric to Christianity.

"Our writers do not waste their time in polishing periods," declares Basil of Caesarea, "we prefer clarity of expression to mere euphony." And again, "The school of God does not recognize the laws of the encomium," nor does it deal in "sophistic vanities."[22]

The most extreme Christian viewpoint seemed to be that rhetorical forms might be dispensed with altogether. In the middle of the third century Cyprian had posed the problem as follows:

> In courts of law, in public meetings, in political discussions, a full eloquence may be the pride of vocal ambition, but in speaking of the Lord God, a pure simplicity of expression (*vocis pura sinceritas non eloquentiae*) which is convincing depends upon the substance of the argument rather than upon the forcefulness of eloquence.[23]

Both Ambrose and Jerome decry rhetorical excesses in their fellow preachers, calling for adherence to Paul's advice. The Donatist Cresconium went so far as to quote Proverbs 10:19 as proof that eloquence was sinful; although this drew a sharp reply from Augustine,[24] the incident may serve as an illustration of the temper of the times.

This is not to say, of course, that opinion was completely aligned in one direction. A true debate took place among the leaders of the Church as official persecution faded into the background and the exigencies of ecclesiastical organization forced new decisions upon its leaders. Some of the most vehement opponents of pagan literature admitted the necessity of education, while others (like Saint Cyprian) resolutely turned their backs upon the old order.

Saint Basil and Saint Ambrose, for example, illustrate the mixed feelings of the Fathers of the Church as they faced a cultural dilemma. Basil recommends gathering roses among the thorns of pagan literature, on one hand, yet warns students not to abandon themselves to their pagan professors' ideas as they would their course to a navigator on a ship.[25] He also feels constrained to defend the Bible even though it is written in "a barbarian tongue." This points up still another cultural problem for the educated ecclesiastic of the fourth century, the apparently unliterary style of the Scriptures. Basil concludes that

[20] Hilarius, *De trinitate* (*PL* X), vii.1.

[21] A. S. Pease, "The Attitude of Jerome toward Pagan Literature," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, L (1919), 150-167.

[22] Cf. James Campbell, *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of Saint Basil the Great* (Patristic Studies, Vol. 2; Washington, D.C., 1922).

[23] Cyprian, *Ad Donatus* 2, quoted in Ellspermann, p. 51.

[24] Augustine, *Contra Cresconium et donatistam libri IIII* (*CSEL*, LII), I.i.2.

[25] Combés, p. 97. For a survey of Basil's reactions to pagan culture, cf. Sister Mary M. Fox, *The Life and Times of Saint Basil the Great as Revealed in His Works* (Patristic Studies, Vol. 57; Washington, D.C., 1939).

"although their style is unlearned, their content is true and they are the thoughts to which we give utterance."[26]

Ambrose also has mixed feelings. Although he emphasizes the distinction between *sapientia sæculi* and *sapientia spiritualis,* he recognizes the need for training of preachers and condemns not rhetoric itself but its sophistic abuses. His defense of the Scriptures is based on his approval of their simple style in contrast with the "showy" language of philosophers and orators. Saint Luke, he asserts, excel, in *stilus historicus.* Nevertheless he admits that rhetorical ornament may sometimes be useful and, indeed, sometimes occurs in the Scriptures themselves.[27]

His ingenious solution to the problem of pagan philosophy, on the other hand, was one which did not win general approval. The pagans, Ambrose states, originally got their wisdom from Scriptures; Plato went to Egypt to "know the deeds of Moses, the oracles of the law, the worthy sayings of the prophets."[28] As Laistner observes, this was an attractive way out of a dilemma —one which even attracted Augustine for a time—but one which could not long withstand further inquiry.[29] Ambrose was sufficiently impressed with Roman learning, however, that he modeled his instruction book for priests upon Cicero's *De officiis.*[30] Hilary of Poitiers condemns Arian verbal display, yet prays for a good style in his own sermons. Honor, he says, is given to the word of God by one who speaks with beauty of expression.

But Saint Jerome, contemporary and friend of Augustine, may perhaps illustrate best the inner conflict faced by many Christian leaders in the fourth century. In his famous letter of advice to the virgin Eustochium, he warns:

> What communion hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial? What has Horace to do with the Psalter, Vergil with the Gospels and Cicero with the Apostle [Paul]? . . . we ought not to drink the cup of Christ and the cup of devils at the same time.[31]

Later in the same epistle he relates a dream which came to him after he had been wrestling with the question of whether a Christian could legitimately enjoy the Greek and Roman classics:

> Miserable man that I am! I was fasting and then I began to read Cicero; after many nights spent in watching, after many tears, which the remembrance of my faults of not so long ago drew forth from the depths of my heart, I took Plautus in my hands. If by chance, on recollecting myself, I started reading the Prophets, their unadorned style awoke in me feelings of revulsion. My eyes, blinded, no longer saw the light, and it was not on my eyes that I laid the blame, it was on heaven.
>
> While the old serpent thus misused me, a violent fever penetrated the marrow of my worn-out body towards the middle of Lent, and without any respite, in an incredible manner, it so consumed my poor members that I had scarcely any flesh on my bones. Already people were thinking of my funeral. My body felt quite frozen; a remnant of vital heat no longer palpitated save in the lukewarmness of my poor breast.
>
> Suddenly I felt myself ravished away in ecstacy and transported before the tribunal of the Judge. Such a dazzling light emanated from those present that, crouched on the ground, I dared not lift up my eyes. On being asked my profession, I replied, "I am a Christian." Whereupon He who presided, thundered: "Thou dost lie—thou art not a Christian, but a Ciceronian. Where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also."

[26] Basil, *Epistle* CCCIX, quoted in Fox, p. 89.
[27] Ellspermann, pp. 120-123.
[28] *Ibid.,* p. 114. The idea was of course not original with Ambrose, having antecedents in pre-Christian Alexandrian thought. Cassiodorus repeated it for the later middle ages.
[29] Max W. Laistner, "The Christian Attitude to Pagan Literature," *History,* XX (1935), 49-53.
[30] Ambrose, *De officiis ministrorum (PL* XVI, col. 23-184).
[31] Jerome, *Epistle* XXII *(CSEL,* LIV), translated in Ellspermann, pp. 159-60.

Then Jerome relates that he swore an oath in his dream: "Lord, if it ever happens to me to possess or read profane books, I shall have denied Thee." From that moment the dreamer betook himself "to the reading of the divine books with as much passion as I had formerly given to reading the books of men."[32]

Interpretations of this dream have been many and varied, and it is generally wise to refrain from taking too literally a work designed to point up a moral. Nevertheless, Pease points out, Jerome did refrain from using classical quotations in his works for about fifteen years following the time at which the dream is supposed to have occurred. The very fact that Jerome felt it necessary to reply to Rufinus in A.D. 402 may be another indication of the state of the times, and possibly of his contemporaries' views of his so-called oath.[33]

His basic dilemma reveals itself elsewhere too. At one point he is concerned because heathen sources are used to attack the doctrine of resurrection of the body, and enjoins Christians to "lay aside the weapons of the heathens" in their replies; it is better to have a just unlearnedness than an evil wisdom.[34] In another place:

> We do not wish for the field of rhetorical eloquence, nor the snares of dialecticians, nor do we seek the subtleties of Aristotle, but the very words of Scripture must be set down.[35]

He refers often to his desire for a simple, clear style which will avoid "pomp . . . structures of words," yet he was a student of the famous grammarian Donatus and in later life recommended Demosthenes and Cicero to his students as models.[36]

Jerome employs the figure of the "captive woman" at one point to illustrate his desire to take from the old what was useful for the new order. The figure occurs in Deuteronomy 21:10-13.

> If thou go to fight against thy enemies, and the Lord thy God deliver them to thy hand, and thou lead them away captives, and seest in the number of the captives a beautiful woman, and lovest her, and wilt have her to wife, thou shalt bring her into thy house: and she shall shave her hair, and pare her nails and shall put off the raiment, wherein she was taken: and shall remain in thy house, and mourn for her father and her mother one month: and after that thou shalt go unto her, and shalt sleep with her, and she shall be thy wife.[37]

The captive woman, of course, is secular wisdom, to be purged of its falsities and dangers. The metaphor clarifies the desire of Jerome, but does not specify what is to be sheared away and what is to be kept whole.

In the case at hand—the matter of the worth of rhetoric—his feelings are ambivalent. "Saint Jerome's attitude toward rhetoric," concludes Ellspermann, "cannot be summed up in one bald statement. In the texts considered there is indeed unfeigned favor of the rhetorical art, but there are also sentiments of mixed approval and disapproval, and even of evident disapproval."[38]

Even so, it might be argued at this point that the bulk of these Christian

[32] The translation follows that of Labriolle, pp. 11-12.

[33] A. S. Pease, "The Attitude of Jerome toward Pagan Literature," *TPAPA*, L (1919), 150-167. Rufinus had accused Jerome of teaching the classics and of having a monk copy Cicero.

[34] Ellspermann, p. 157.

[35] Jerome, *Liber contra Helvidium de perpetua virginitate Mariae*, xii, quoted in Sister M. Jamesetta Kelly, *Life and Times as Revealed in the Writings of St. Jerome Exclusive of His Letters* (Patristic Studies, Vol. 52; Washington, D.C., 1944), p. 59.

[36] Jerome, *Epistle* LVIII (*CSEL*, LIV), quoted in Ellspermann, p. 147. Interestingly enough, he also recommends Lysias and the Gracchi. The rest of the list (*e.g.*, for poetry, Homer, Virgil, Menander, and Terence) is reminiscent of the typical Roman grammar school curriculum.

[37] Cf. *De Doctrina* II. xl.60-xlii.63, where Augustine compares useful pagan learning to the gold and silver which the Israelites took away from Egypt in the Exodus.

[38] Ellspermann, p. 167.

statements might be attributed to a reluctance to acknowledge publicly the worth of the Roman cultural heritage, while at the same time taking advantage of it. The Church Fathers were trained in Roman rhetorical schools, and many had actually taught rhetoric themselves. It might be expected that they would readily avail themselves of their training.

Nevertheless, two factors must be appreciated. The first is that the few citations offered above could be multiplied many times, the abundance of Christian comment offering clear indication that this issue was one of real concern up to and including the fourth century.[39]

A second point is that, despite the rhetorical training of the major ecclesiastical orators, the fourth century marks a high point of popularity for the simple "homily" style of preaching. Students of such preachers as Chrysostom and Basil have generally concluded that their sermons show less of the contemporary sophistic than might ordinarily be expected from men of their educational background. Coupled with the many utterances denouncing the sophistic, the comparative simplicity of the homilies might be seen as further indication of the dilemma of the times.[40] The reader's attention is directed, for example, to Chrysostom's first homily on the Statues: the sermon has no proper beginning or end, and might satisfactorily be ended at any point without damaging the speaker's point; the use of figures is comparatively restrained, and there is virtually no repetition for emphasis.

Whatever the modern critic may decide about the intrinsic merit of the homily form of the fourth century, its very appearance in a highly sophisticated age might well argue a deliberate choice on the part of preachers. It was an age, after all, when the same man who delivered the eulogy for the arch-sophist Prohaeresius could castigate a friend for forsaking Christian books for the rhetorician's trade.[41] It was an age also in which former teachers of rhetoric—Jerome, Basil, and Augustine, among others—felt that they must decide whether their former profession deserved a place in the new order.

The resolution of this question was demanded at a critical period in the history of Western culture, for the barbarian erosion of the Roman Empire was already well under way. Alaric swept into Rome itself in 410, and Augustine's episcopal seat of Hippo was under Vandal seige as he lay on his deathbed in 430. The homogeneous Roman culture had already begun to suffer from the questionings of the new Christian element within it, and at the same time it faced annihilation from without. From the Christian point of view, it was an age of selection, a time to examine the *sapientia sæculi* to extract from a thousand-year-old heritage whatever would aid in the work of the Lord. The decisions made would influence Western culture for another thousand years.

[39] For other discussions, see Laistner, *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire* (Ithaca, New York, 1951), pp. 49-73; Franz Maier, *Augustin und das antike Rom* (Stuttgart, 1955), especially pp. 17-36 and 206-214; E. K. Rand, *Founders of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1957 reprint), pp. 1-134; and Labriolle, pp. 6-32.

[40] Thomas E. Ameringer, *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom* (Patristic Studies, Vol. 6; Washington, D.C., 1921); Sister M. Albania Burns, *St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of Rhetorical Qualities and Form* (Patristic Studies, Vol. 22; Washington, D.C., 1930); and Campbell, *op. cit.* Sample homilies are printed in a number of anthologies, including those of Guy Lee, David Brewer, and Mabel Platz.

[41] Gregory Naziensus. For a revealing biography of the notorious Prohaeresius, perhaps the best single exemplar of the Second Sophistic, see Philostratus and Eunapius, *Lives of the Sophists*, trans. Wilmer C. Wright (Loeb Classical Library; London, 1922).

The historian is often tempted into a feeling of inevitability about events, a feeling that since events took a certain turn they could have taken no other. But it has been noted that some of the most influential Christians were at least undecided about the role of rhetoric and indeed about Roman culture in many aspects. When it is recalled that Greco-Roman culture was largely transmitted to the early Middle Ages through the very narrow funnel of the encyclopedists like Isidore and Cassiodorus, it might well be wondered what might have occurred if a spokesman as influential as Augustine had denied rhetoric a place in Christian culture.[42]

It was perhaps inevitable that Augustine's opinions would have a strong influence on the future development of rhetoric—if for no other reason than his general influence in a number of fields which gave added weight to his rhetorical ideas. Moreover, the *De Doctrina* provided the basic statement of a Christian homiletic until the emergence of the highly-formalized "thematic" or "University Style" sermon about the beginning of the thirteenth century.[43] In light of these factors, then, it would seem useful not only to identify Augustine's contribution to the debate, but to determine his own assessment of the problems presented in it.

Augustine composed the four books of *De Doctrina Christiana*[44] between 396 and 426, the first three books being completed almost a quarter of a century before he decided to resume work on the volume by adding Book Four. His goal was a treatise which would give the preacher both the substance and the form for sermons:

> There are two things necessary to the treatment of the Scriptures: a way of discovering (*modus inveniendi*) those things which are to be understood, and a way of expressing to others (*modus proferendi*) what we have learned.[45]

The first three books deal with the *materia* of the sermons—that is, with the ways in which the words of Scripture may be understood. Book One deals with signs of realities, Book Two with words as conventional signs, and Book Three with the problem of ambiguity. Throughout the three books he is concerned with the uses of words, and points out that the preacher needs a knowledge of language to equip himself with the tools of understanding. Thus he treats both ambiguities growing out of words used literally, and ambiguities deriving from words used figuratively.

It is plain throughout that he intends the student of this subject to master the ordinary things taught in the schools. Although Augustine severely limits the number of things which a student might profitably learn from the profane culture, he is equally quick to point out that the young should pursue "those human institutions helpful to social in-

[42] Portions of the following have appeared in *Western Speech*, XXII (1958), 24-29.

[43] To the best of this writer's knowledge, the texts of the sermons preached at the University of Paris during the academic year 1230-31 provide the earliest evidence of a new sermon mode. See the Latin texts in M. M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-31: contribution a l'histoire de la prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1931). The earliest extant manuals of the new style are of an even later date. Cf. Ray C. Petry, *No Uncertain Sound: Sermons that Shaped the Pulpit Tradition* (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 4 ff.

[44] *S. Aurelii Augustini de doctrina christiana libros quattor*, edidit H. J. Vogels (Florilegium Patristicum, Fasciculus XXIV; Bonnae, 1930). For an easily available translation, see *Saint Augustine on Christian Doctrine*, trans. D. W. Robertson (Library of Liberal Arts, No. 80; New York, 1958). The fourth book is edited with translation and commentary by Sister Therese Sullivan in Patristic Studies, Vol. 23. Charles S. Baldwin supplies a brief summary of Book Four in his *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic*, chap. ii.

[45] *De Doctrina*, II.i.1.

tercourse in the necessary pursuits of life."[46]

But it is the fourth book which contains an outspoken plea for the use of *eloquentia* in Christian oratory, making the volume what has been called "the first manual of Christian rhetoric." His basic principle is presented in an *a fortiori* argument early in the book:

> But a man who has merely an empty flow of eloquence ought the more to be guarded against as he is the more pleasing to those in his audience in those matters which have no expedience, and, as his audience hears him speak with fluency, it judges likewise that he speaks with truth. This view, indeed, did not escape even those who considered rhetorical training necessary, for they hold that wisdom without eloquence is of small avail to a country, but that eloquence without wisdom is generally a great hindrance, and never a help. If, therefore, those who have given us the rules of oratory, in the very books in which they have treated this subject are forced through the urgency of truth to make this confession, ignorant as they are of the true, the supernal wisdom which comes down from the Father of Lights, how much more so are we, the ministers and children of this wisdom, under obligation to hold no other opinion?[47]

In an effort to combat the point of view represented by such writers as Cyprian and Cresconium, he restates the point in another place:

> For since through the art of rhetoric both truth and falsehood are pleaded, who would be so bold as to say that against falsehood, truth as regards its own defenders ought to stand unarmed, so that, forsooth, those who attempt to plead false causes know from the beginning how to make their audience well-disposed, attentive, and docile . . . so that the one, moving and impelling the minds of the audience to error by the force of its oratory, now strikes them with terror, now saddens them, now enlivens them, now ardently arouses them; but the other, in the cause of truth, is sluggish and cold and falls asleep! Who is so foolish to be thus wise?[48]

Augustine takes his stand, therefore, in the great debate about the use to which the new Christian society is to put the *sapientia mundi*. He declares that the art of eloquence should be put into active service, and not rejected out of hand because it is tainted with paganism. To those who might reply that rhetoric is the tool of the wicked, he responds with the Aristotelian dictum that the art can serve both truth and falsehood:

> Since, therefore, there has been placed equally at our disposal the power of eloquence, which is so efficacious in pleading either for the erroneous cause or the right, why is it not zealously acquired by the good, so as to do service for the truth?[49]

Still another concern to ecclesiastical authorities in the fourth century was the matter of examples to be used in literary education. Almost every writer from Paul to Jerome had warned of the dangers inherent in sending Christians to schools which taught through *imitatio* of Homer and Virgil. Augustine's proposal is to look at the Scriptures themselves for examples of style, and the bulk of Book Four is taken up with an attempt to demonstrate how this could be done. Indeed, Augustine postulates the existence of a new type of eloquence:

> Thus there is a kind of eloquence fitting for men most worthy of the highest authority and clearly inspired by God. Our authors speak with an eloquence of this kind, nor does any other kind become them.[50]

[46] *Ibid.*, II.xxxix.58. In the same book he refers to "rules of eloquence" as desirable, II.xxxvi.54.

[47] *Ibid.*, IV.v.8. The reference to "wisdom. . . . eloquence" is to the opening passage of Cicero's *De inventione*.

[48] *De Doctrina*, IV.2.3. The *officia* of the *exordium* of a speech in Roman rhetorical theory was to render the audience "attentive, docile, and well-disposed." Cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, I.iv.6 and *De inventione*, I.xv.20.

[49] *De Doctrina*, IV.iii.3. He expresses the same idea elsewhere: *ibid.*, II.xxvi.54, and *Contra Cresconium*, I.i.2.

[50] *De Doctrina*, IV.vi.9. Sections xviii through xxvi of Book Four provide numerous examples, especially from Saint Paul. It is interesting to note that when Saint Bede wished to provide

Since Ciceronian rhetorical doctrine insisted that three levels of style must be employed, however, Augustine is careful to show that all three levels exist in the Scripture.

It should be noted also that Augustine is unwilling to relegate rhetoric to the position of a mere preliminary study. Instead he wishes to use it in the active service of the ministry. Jerome and Ambrose were apparently somewhat willing to accord rhetoric a place in primary education, but were unsure of the extent to which it should be allowed elsewhere. Augustine insists upon the homiletic utility of the subject, whether its study followed *praecepta* or *imitatio*.[51]

Moreover, it will be recalled, he begins the *De Doctrina* with the statement that the *modus inveniendi*, or means of discovery, is distinct from the *modus proferendi*, or means of expression. The structure of the whole work therefore becomes an argument for the necessity of studying the "means of expression" with the same care given to the study of the Scriptures themselves. The disproportionate amount of space accorded each of the two subjects is due to the fact that he is in a sense creating the first, while merely arguing for the use of the second. It is for this reason that he begins Book Four with the statement that he does not intend to supply the rules of rhetoric which can be found elsewhere. Book Four is intended as a *ratio eloquentiae Christianae*.

It would therefore seem to be misleading to imply, as do Baldwin and Sister Therese Sullivan, that Augustine intended the fourth book of *De Doctrina* as a mere rejection of the Second Sophistic. Certainly his attitude toward the "empty eloquence" of the sophistic is clear enough, but this was an attitude which was shared after all by every one of his Christian contemporaries and thus one which needed little proof.

Instead it might be more nearly accurate to say that he saw the dangers of an opposite rhetorical heresy. The sin of the sophist is that he denies the necessity of subject matter and believes that *forma* alone is desirable. An opposite vice, one to which historians of rhetoric have never given a name, depends upon the belief that the man possessed of truth will *ipso facto* be able to communicate the truth to others. It is a dependence upon *materia* alone. Its chief proponent in ancient times was the young Plato, and it would seem fair to label it the "Platonic rhetorical heresy" just as we apply the term "sophistry" to its opposite theory. This is not to say that the ecclesiastical writers of the fourth century looked to the *Gorgias* and *Protagoras* for a theory of communication, but rather that their reactions to the pagan culture of Rome led many of them to take up a somewhat similar attitude toward the rhetoric which was a part of that culture. Augustine apparently recognized a danger in this aspect of the cultural debate of his times, and used the *De Doctrina* to urge a union of both matter and form in Christian preaching.

Only if one views the book as a part of the great debate of the fourth century, therefore, does its historical importance emerge clearly. The reader is

examples of the tropes and schemes of the Latin Grammarian Donatus, he was able to produce 122 Scriptural passages to illustrate them. Bede, *Liber de scematibus et tropis*, in Carolus Halm (ed.), *Rhetores Minores Latini* (Lipsiae, 1863), pp. 607-18.

[51] Roman rhetorical training followed three major methods: the teaching of rules *(praecepta)*, the imitation of models *(imitatio)*, and free composition on a theme *(declamatio)*. Augustine in Book Four seems to favor *imitatio* as a method of acquiring eloquence (cf. IV.iii.4-5), but it must be noted that earlier he recommends study of *praecepta* (II.xxxix.58). For a comment on Augustine's possible larger uneasiness later about his recommendation, cf. Laistner, "The Christian Attitude to Pagan Literature," *History*, XX (1935), 51.

struck by the author's insistence upon the folly of abandoning a useful tool to the enemy. For this is a book written, not for enemies, but for other Christians. It can only be his own fellows in the Church whom he describes as "dull and cold" (*lenti fridique*)[1] when they try to speak as if the mere utterance of God's Word would by itself move the minds of men. Augustine appreciates the role of God's grace in preaching, but he warns that the preacher must do his work well too.[52]

The *De Doctrina Christiana* emerges, consequently, as a book written as a rebuttal to those who would deprive the Church of a useful tool in the work of winning souls. Significantly, the debate ends with its appearance. Marie Comeau states the conclusion well:

> Il était indispensable qu'Augustin abordât dans ce traité la question de la légitimité de la rhétorique, question constamment agitée depuis Platon, et que le christianisme présentait sous un jour nouveau. Il semble avoir dit le dernier mot sur le problème.[53]

[52] *De Doctrina*, IV.xv and IV.xxx. For an analysis of an earlier treatment of the same problem, see Jean Daniélou, *Origen*, trans. Walter Mitchell (New York, 1955), pp. 102 ff.

[53] Marie Comeau, *La rhétorique de Saint Augustin d'apres les Tractatus in Joannem* (Paris, 1930), p. xv.

BLOOMFIELD'S FINAL CLUSTERS

James W. Abel

RECENTLY in *QJS,* David B. Strother[1] presented a schematic interpretation of Bloomfield's initial and final non-syllabic clusters,[2] subsequently referred to here as consonant clusters. Such a presentation is highly desirable, because, as Strother says, even though not exhaustive,[3] Bloomfield's findings are useful, although set forth in a manner to discourage their use.

Strother's tabular scheme is admirably legible and brief, but as understood by the writer, it sometimes misleads as to the results of Bloomfield's analysis.[4] This observation is made because Strother's interpretation does not always coincide with two other catalogues derived from Bloomfield's work. These agree with each other at all presently pertinent points. One of these catalogues appears in a doctoral dissertation by Betty J. Wallace;[5] the other was made several years ago by the writer for his own use. Specific examples of apparent shortcomings in Strother's scheme should be clearer after an explanation of Bloomfield's manner of presentation.

Bloomfield divides the members of consonant clusters into four groups according to their position in the cluster. These positions and their possible combinations can be shown in this way:

	Without post final	With post final
Main final		(a) *bets* [-ts]
Pre-final + main final	(b) *test* [-st]	(c) *tests* [-sts]
Second pre-final + pre-final + main final	(d) *text* [-kst]	(e) *texts* [-ksts][6]

After having thus framed their overall structure, by means of exemplified general statements, Bloomfield describes the membership of clusters of the types labelled (a), (b), and (d) above. However, he neither describes nor exemplifies types (c) and (e). In view of his overall framework, it is assumed he intended the formation of clusters of these types according to his general statements specifying the appearance of post finals. This assumption makes possible many common clusters which otherwise would be missing from a catalogue based on his general statements.

Since the same consonant may appear in more than one of the four positions, a step-by-step working out of Bloom-

Mr. Abel is Assistant Professor of Speech, Brooklyn College.

[1] David B. Strother, "Bloomfield's 'Non-Syllabic' Clusters," *QJS,* XLV (April 1959), 189-190.

[2] The analysis referred to concerns English and is found in Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (New York, 1933), pp. 131-134.

[3] In this connection, Edward T. Erazmus makes the observation that it would be "better to recognize here as done with other features that we are dealing with an open end phenomenon." *Language Learning,* IX (1959), 79.

[4] The only oversight found in Strother's presentation of initial clusters is provision for [ʃw-]; Bloomfield (p. 131) says "[w] never comes after [p, b, f, š]. . . ." ([š] = [ʃ].)

[5] "A Quantitative Analysis of Consonant Clusters in Present-Day English" (University of Michigan, 1950), pp. 30-34.

[6] Slightly adapted from the original, Bloomfield, p. 132.

Main Final		p	b	t	d	k	g	m	n	ŋ	l	f	v	θ	ð	s	z	ʃ	ʒ	tʃ	dʒ	r
Post Final		t s	d z	s	z	t s	d z	d z	d z	d z	d z	t s	d z	t s	d z	t	d	t	d	t	d	d z
2nd Pre-final	Pre-final																					
	p			xx										345		xx						
	t													xxx		xx						
	d													x4x			xx					
	k			xx												xx						
	m	xxx		2								xxx										
	n			xx	xx							7		xxx		xx	xx	7		x x	x x	
	ŋ					xxx								x4x								
	l	xxx	xxx	xx	xx	xxx		xxx	xxx			xxx	xxx	x4x		xx		xx		x x	x x	
	f			xx										345								
	θ 1																					
	ð							xxx														
	s	xxx		xx		xxx																
	z							xxx														
	ʒ 1																					
	r	xxx	xxx	xx	xx	xxx		xxx	xxx		666	xxx	xxx	xxx		xx	7	x4		x x	x x	
k	s			xx										345								
m	p			xx												xx						
ŋ	k															xx						
l	t															35						
r	p			35																		
	t															xx						
	m													x4x								
	n			3																		
	s			35																		

Notes:

1. Bloomfield (p. 133) excludes [b, g, tʃ, dʒ, v, ʃ] from the list of pre-final consonants, but not [θ, ʒ]. However, when he subsequently specifies the clusters made up of pre-finals + main finals, no mention is made of [θ, ʒ] as pre-finals.

2. Bloomfield (p. 133) gives the single example *dreamt* for pre-final [m] + main final [t]. There seems to be reason for considering [t] a post final, as Bloomfield himself does with regard to both *dreamt* and *burnt* in "The Stressed Vowels of American English" (p. 99). Wallace (p. 32) uses Bloomfield's *dreamt* without questioning it. When she provides her own examples for pre-finals + main finals + post finals, she uses *pre-empts*, presumably having in mind an alternate British pronunciation. (See Daniel Jones, *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*.)

3. These clusters appear among the examples in "The Stressed Vowels of American English," pp. 103, 110, and 111. In the case of [rnt] see note 2, above.

4. These clusters are allowed by Bloomfield's general statements controlling post final [t] (pp. 132-133), but no examples of them have been found. In the case of [rʃt], Wallace (p. 32) provides *marshed*. Neither *Webster's* nor OED gives *marsh* as a verb.

5. Obtained by adding post final [s] or [t] to the immediately adjacent two- or three-member cluster, according to the general statements in Bloomfield's *Language*.

6. Bloomfield's general statements allow for [rl], but it is not exemplified even though the examples of which it should be a part are so introduced as to be considered exhaustive of the clusters in which [r] is a pre-final. Wallace (p. 32) makes a similar observation and subsequently lists [rl] + the post finals [d] and [z] "on the assumption that the first omission was an oversight."

7. These clusters are illustrated by the proper names *Banff*, *Mars*, and *Blanche* in "The Stressed Vowels of American English," pp. 105, 106, and 107.

field's combinatory formulas produces a list containing duplicate clusters. For example, [nd] as in *end*, consisting of pre-final [n] and main final [d], and [nd] as in *fanned*, consisting of main final [n] and post final [d].[7]

Though he does not say so, Strother understandably may have wished to present a scheme which does not produce duplicates. If this be the case, it would seem he should have dispensed with Bloomfield's groupings, but he did not. Therefore, it appears his scheme hardly does Bloomfield justice. For example, the part devoted to main finals + post finals fails to provide for main final [n] + post final [d], the cluster [nd] appearing only in the portion devoted to pre-finals + main finals with and without post finals. Similarly, in this portion of the scheme, pre-final [p] + main final [t] is not provided for, the cluster [pt] occurring in the scheme only as a combination of main final [p] + post final [t]. Failure to make any schematic provision for clusters described by Bloomfield may be exemplified by the absence of pre-final [t] + post final [θ] and by the failure to provide for clusters beginning with the second pre-finals [m] and [ŋ].

Here is an attempt to display all the final clusters derivable from Bloomfield's general statements, together with additional clusters which appear incidental to his analysis of vowel contexts in "The Stressed Vowels of American English,"[8] on an annotated table whose coordinates are Bloomfield's four positional groupings. The arrangement of the table and the way to read it are as follows:

The consonants which appear as main finals constitute the upper horizontal coordinate, and the four post finals, [t, d, s, z] appropriately repeated, form the lower horizontal coordinate. An existent main final + post final cluster is derived by combining a given main final with its immediately subordinate post final(s). For example, [pt, ps], but only [ts].

Pre-final consonants make up the right-hand vertical coordinate. An "x" opposite one of these entries and beneath an entry for a main final or a main final + post final cluster means, respectively, the occurrence of a pre-final + main final cluster or a pre-final + main final + post final cluster. For example, [mp, mpt, mps]. Notes corresponding to the numerals in the table explain these entries.

Second pre-finals form the left-hand vertical coordinate. The membership of a cluster beginning with a second pre-final is read from left to right across the vertical coordinates and on to the right until an "x" is encountered beneath the main final or the main final + post final which completes the cluster in point. For example, [mps, mpst]. In the case of second pre-final [r], the pre-finals which follow it are both immediately to the right and to the right and down. Numerals refer to explanatory notes.

[7] Wallace (p. 34) lists seventeen duplicates.
[8] Bloomfield, "The Stressed Vowels of American English," *Language*, XI (1935), 97-116.

ATTITUDINAL EFFECTS OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Shifts on Certainty-Uncertainty and Agreement-Disagreement Continua

Ray H. Simpson

SMALL classroom groups are widely used as a teaching procedure. The degree of understanding about what may be accomplished through the use of such groups leaves much to be desired. Results from discussions may be considered on many dimensions. In this study are reported some indications of the effects of discussion on two dimensions, shifts on the certainty-uncertainty continuum and on the agreement-disagreement continuum.

Related Research

There have been numerous experiments which show that small group discussions are likely to produce changes in attitudes.

After making an extensive review of research by such investigators as Festinger,[1] Back,[2] Kelley,[3] Thibaut,[4] Schachter,[5] and Thibaut and Coules,[6] Deutsch,[7] concluded that lack of agreement among members of a group provides an unstable basis for beliefs. The characteristic urge among discussants for cognitive balance, which is likely to be partially achieved through group discussion, typically produces some attitude changes.

Other elements which are likely to produce attitude changes through discussion have been suggested by various researchers: Back, for example, suggests pressures toward uniformity in a group. Luchins and Luchins[8] have shown that the greater the ambiguity of a perceived stimulus situation (statements in this study) the more readily can changes be produced. Tresselt[9] emphasizes that the more firmly a reference point is learned,

Mr. Simpson has contributed to QJS *three previous articles on discussion. His first was "The Effect of Discussion on Intra-Group Divergencies of Judgment" (XXV, 547-552). He is author of* A Study of Those Who Influence and of Those Who Are Influenced by Discussion *(New York, 1938), and co-author of* Educational Psychology *(New York, 1954). He is Professor of Education, University of Illinois.* *Assistance from his University's Bureau of Educational Research is acknowledged.*

[1] L. Festinger, "Informal Social Communication," *Psychological Review*, LVII (September 1950), 271-282.

[2] K. Back, "The Exertion of Influence Through Social Communication," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVI (January 1951), 9-23.

[3] H. H. Kelley, "Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies," *Human Relations*, IV (No. 1, 1951), 39-56.

[4] S. Thibaut, "An Experimental Study of the Cohesiveness of Underprivileged Groups," *Human Relations*, III (No. 3, 1950), 251-278.

[5] S. Schachter, "Deviation, Rejection and Communication," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLII (April 1951), 190-270.

[6] J. W. Thibaut and J. Coules, "The Role of Communication in the Reduction of Interpersonal Hostility," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVII (October 1952), 770-777.

[7] M. Deutsch, "Field Theory in Social Psychology," in *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954), pp. 181-222.

[8] A. S. Luchins and E. H. Luchins, "Previous Experience with Ambiguous and Nonambiguous Stimuli Under Various Social Influences," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XLII (November 1955), 249-270.

[9] M. E. Tresselt, "The Influence of the Amount of Practice upon the Formation of a Scale of Judgment," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXVII (June 1947), 251-260.

the greater its effect upon, or utility as a reference point for, other scales of judgment. In the current study the firmness with which a statement is believed would be likely to affect the amount of change which could be expected from discussion. Tresselt also suggests discussion changes in attitude are likely to be generalizable. Thus, discussion of some statements in the current study could be expected to produce changes in attitudes toward related undiscussed statements.

Kelley and Thibaut[10] concluded that "broadly speaking, resistance [to change] stems from the strength of initial opinions; the basis they have in fact, experience, or logic, the person's 'anchorage' through loyalty to other groups and possibly the fact of overt commitment to a given point of view. The amount of change produced in any case may be considered to be a resultant of the strength of influence exerted minus the strength of the resistance to change." Since post discussion responses were given on an individual and not public basis in the current study, this would radically decrease the importance of "overt commitment."

The fact that changes in attitudes can be produced through discussion has been well substantiated. The exact nature of these changes under specified circumstances is a field where much research is needed. The study reported here deals with the nature of discussion produced changes in two dimensions.

Purpose of Investigation

The purpose of the investigation reported here is to get some experimental answers to the following questions: (1) Does discussion in small classroom groups lead to greater certainty on the part of individual discussants relative to positions held on issues discussed? (2) After discussion are individuals likely to be more or less critical of statements which formed the basis for the discussion?

Procedures Used in the Study

The instrument used for both testing and discussion purposes in the study was the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. It consists of 150 statements "designed to measure those attitudes of a teacher which predict how well he will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships, and indirectly how well satisfied he will be with teaching as a vocation."[11] A statement, illustrative of those in the Inventory is this: "A child should be taught to obey an adult without question."

In taking the Inventory the respondent is told: "There is considerable disagreement as to what these relations [teacher-pupil relations] should be; therefore, there are no right or wrong answers. What is wanted is your individual feeling about the statements. Read each statement and decide how YOU feel about it. . . ." The respondent may choose one of five possible answers for each question: (1) SA, meaning strongly agree, (2) A, agree, (3) U, uncertain, (4) D, disagree, (5) SD, strongly disagree.

The 297 subjects in the experiment were third-, fourth-, or fifth-year university students in "Educational Psychology" or "Psychology of Learning for Teachers." The pattern followed by the 268 students in the experimental groups was as follows: (1) Each took a pretest on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. (2) One week after pretest each discussant participated in a small group

[10] H. H. Kelley and J. W. Thibaut, "Experimental Studies of Group Problem Solving and Process," in *Handbook of Social Psychology* (see note 7), p. 743.

[11] W. W. Cook, C. H. Leeds, and R. Calbs, *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory* (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951), p. 3.

discussion for 50 minutes using the MTAI as a basis for the discussion. (3) One week after the discussion each took a retest on the MTAI. The 25 discussion groups ranged in size from 3 to 7. Discussants' directions were to get the points of view of others in the group and where disagreements existed to try to get the reasons for the disagreements. The number of statements which each group discussed was optional with the group. Each group spent most time on statements about which there was most disagreement in the group. In general, the larger the group the fewer the number of statements discussed. Each discussion group also compiled a group answer sheet which represented the conclusion of the group on each issue discussed.

The control group consisted of 29 individuals each of whom took the MTAI pretest and retest at the same times as the experimental subjects but who participated in no intervening discussion.

Change in Certainty of Opinion Caused by Discussion

Does discussion cause a discussant to be more or less certain that the position which he holds is the right position? In other words, is discussion likely to lead to more or less strongly held positions on statements which are discussed?

For each subject in the control group and in the experimental groups a *"certainty of opinion score"* based on pretest responses was computed in the following way:

Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Weight	2	1	0	1	2

1. Each response of "Strongly Agree" or "Strongly Disagree," indicating responder felt certain about response, was given a weighting of two.
2. Each response of "Agree" or "Disagree," indicating a moderate degree of certainty, was given a weight of one.
3. Each response of "Uncertain" was given no weight.
4. All weights on the pretest for each subject were summated. The resulting figure was taken as an indication of degree of certainty of position on the statements evaluated. This score is labeled "Pretest Certainty Score."

A Post-test Certainty Score based on retest responses was computed in a similar manner for each subject.

When the Pretest Certainty Score was subtracted from the Post-test Certainty Score for each subject, the difference gives an indication of amount of net shift in certainty of opinions from pretest to retest.

A comparison of results from discussion groups and from the control group (no participation in discussion) indicated a nominal (-1.36) mean change toward uncertainty for the control group and a substantial mean change toward certainty of position (13.0) on the part of those who participated in the small group discussions. The difference of 14.36 between the control and the experimental groups is statistically significant at the one per cent level of confidence.

Thus, it would appear that discussion of statements of the sort used in the MTAI leads discussants to be significantly more firm in their positions relative to the issues discussed.

Changes in Position

Does discussion lead discussants to more or less agreement with statements discussed? More specifically, does discussion of statements such as those in the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory tend to produce greater or less agreement with such statements? The tech-

nique used to get a measure of the extent to which an individual agreed with the statements was to assign weights of the following sort to responses:

Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Weight	+2	+1	0	—1	—2

Summation of weights assigned to each individual's responses produced an indication of the extent to which the responder agreed with the statements. In this way, an Agreement-Disagreement score was obtained for each subject on the pretest. What was being measured was extent of agreement with the statements, *not* agreement of discussants with each other nor agreement with a key. A second Agreement-Disagreement score was obtained in a similar fashion on the retest.

The difference between the scores on the pretest and the retest was taken as indication of movement on the Agreement-Disagreement continuum from pretest to retest. For example, if an individual had a score of 10 on the pretest and —8 on the retest, his shift was —18, indicating a net movement toward disagreement with the statements.

The mean net movement of the experimental (discussion) subjects was —12.50, whereas that of the control (no discussion) subjects was —2.05. Thus in both groups there was a *trend toward greater disagreement*, as indicated by the negative sign, from pretest to retest. The difference between experimental groups and the control group was —10.45. This difference was found to be statistically significant at the one per cent level of confidence.

Thus it would appear that 50 minutes of discussion tends to generate more doubt than confidence in the statements discussed.

Hypotheses for Teaching

The results of this study suggest the following hypotheses for consideration and possible investigation:

A. Where the teacher or discussion leader wishes students to have more reasoned, or firmer base for subjective judgments relative to controversial statements, the small group discussion offers distinct possibilities.

B. Small group discussions offer a potentially valuable means for raising doubts in the minds of students about the adequacy or accuracy of statements. When the teacher feels students too readily accept printed statements without critical thought, the use of small discussion groups is likely to be of help in counteracting this tendency.

Summary and Conclusions

Experimental and control groups both took the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory twice, with an interval of two weeks. Between the first and second administration the 268 students in 55 experimental groups each participated in a fifty-minute discussion of issues in the test. The 29 individuals in the control group engaged in no discussion.

With the experimental setup indicated, results show that small group discussion produced significant shifts: (1) Toward certainty of the rightness of individual positions on issues considered. (2) Toward disagreement with the statements discussed. Thus, the discussant seems to feel more competent in an area after he has discussed it. On the other hand, he is likely to feel less sure that statements forming the original basis for discussion are sound. In brief the discussant seems to feel more confidence in himself and less confidence in the statements presented to him for discussion.

JOSEPH McKEAN: THE SECOND BOYLSTON PROFESSOR OF RHETORIC AND ORATORY

Paul E. Ried

ON Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge, Massachusetts, directly across from J. August, Haberdashers (1320 Massachusetts Avenue), stands one of the many gates to the campus of Harvard University. This particular gate was built in 1901 with the following inscription:

THE McKEAN GATE

The Reverend Joseph McKean St. D., LL.D.
Born at Ipswich, Massachusetts 19, April 1776
Died at Havana, Cuba 17, March 1818
A Graduate of this college 1794
Teacher of Youth Minister of the Gospel
Boylston Professor of Rhetoric
and Oratory 1809-1818

This gate is erected to the memory of
Joseph McKean
By the members of the Porcellian Club of
which he was the honored founder

Beyond the limits of Boston, Joseph McKean is little known or remembered today and many pass his monument without a pause. His name appears in the list of Boylston Professors between John Quincy Adams, the first to hold the Chair, and Edward Tyrrel Channing, the third in that office. The office has given the second Boylston Professor his claim on posterity and the gate is symbolic of his career.

1.

In his article sketching the history of the Boylston Professorship, Ronald F. Reid made brief comment on the rhetoric of Joseph McKean.[1] In the past 130 years, with the exception of Reid's article, nothing has been published about the second Boylston Lecturer. McKean lived a short life. His career was promising for a time, but he had tuberculosis all his adult life and died while still Boylston Professor at the age of forty-one.

Raised in the New England tradition of the late eighteenth century, McKean was schooled in the public system and then attended the academy at Andover, where he followed a classical curriculum in preparation for college studies.[2] Upon his admission to Harvard in 1790 he distinguished himself in mathematics and the classics. He was graduated in 1794. After teaching school for three years, he returned to Harvard and completed his work for a degree in theology. In November of 1797, McKean resigned as Grand Marshall of the Porcellian Club,[3] which he had helped to establish at Harvard, and accepted an invitation to become the fourth minister of the First Church of Milton, Massachusetts.

At Milton, the young preacher was noted for his sermons.[4] In his preparation as a speaker he examined the works of critics and commentators on theological issues and then explained them from the pulpit. This tendency to collect and analyze critical reviews was

Mr. Ried is Assistant Professor of Speech, Central Missouri State College. Materials for this essay are drawn from his Ph.D. dissertation, "The Philosophy of American Rhetoric as it Developed in the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University," The Ohio State University, June, 1959.

1 Ronald F. Reid, "The Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory, 1806-1904," *QJS*, XLV (October 1959), 241.

2 Levi Hedge, *Eulogy on Joseph McKean* (Cambridge, 1818), p. 6.

3 *Porcellian Club Centennial, 1791-1891* (Cambridge, 1891).

4 Joseph Dana, *The Mourner's Relief. A Sermon* (Newburyport, 1818), p. 15.

fully revealed twelve years later, when he lectured as Boylston Professor to students at Harvard. McKean's style in the pulpit was effective: "In the pulpit, his manner was serious and fervent; his discourses plain, evangelical, and persuasive."[5] N. L. Frothingham, McKean's student and later his assistant, observed that wherever McKean went as a preacher, he was paid respectful attention and regarded with deep interest. This effect was due in part to his "imposing figure and manner" and his "solemn fervor." Frothingham added that "The rhetorical language of his devotions, apparently unselected and inspired by the moment, flowed over his audience with copious power."[6] McKean's appearance in the pulpit, although not graceful, was "massive and grand." His physical characteristics were a real asset. He looked like a portrait of Lorenzo de Medici, according to Frothingham, who said, "his full black eyes threw their expression from under a brow and forehead that might almost be called severe. . . . His voice was deep and rich, corresponding to such a physiognomy."[7]

McKean's resignation at Milton was abrupt. As a result of a severe "pulmonary attack" he was sent, by the request of his doctor, to the Barbados. The mild southern climate revitalized his health for a time, but he never regained fully the vitality that was characteristic of his youth. McKean returned to New England to accept an appointment to the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory in the summer of 1809 and was installed October 31, 1809.

During his nine-year tenure in the Boylston Chair, McKean received many honors. He was Recording Secretary of the Massachusetts Historical Society, honorary member of the Historical Society of New York, and a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He accepted the Doctor of Laws degree from Princeton University, and the Doctor of Divinity degree from Allegheny College. He delivered a number of speeches during these years. They are on record in the Widener Library at Harvard University.[8]

In October of 1817, McKean fell ill again. He went to Havana, Cuba and, after six months, died. His body was buried in the Cemetery Espada en la Habana. Twenty-two years later his "bones were transferred to the osario, in other words, to the indiscriminate heap in the corners of the cemetery."[9]

2.

There is no substantial account of Joseph McKean's lectures. That McKean's rhetoric has never been the primary purpose of published research may be explained by the inaccessibility of his lectures until recently. His papers on rhetoric, a part of the Folsom collection, were given to Harvard in 1923 by Mrs. C. H. Taylor.[10] McKean's lectures on rhetoric extend to five hundred pages. They are written in ink on lined, 8½ x 11 pages. All of the lectures, with the exception of the first, give an indication that McKean wrote only a first draft. Most of his manuscripts are in-

[5] Hedge, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

[6] William B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* (New York, 1857), II, 420.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 418.

[8] McKean's speeches are as follows: A Valedictory Sermon preached in Milton, September 30, 1804; A Plea for Friendship and Patriotism, in two Discourses at First Church in Boston, March 27, 1814 and April 7, 1814; Sermon delivered at the Ordination of Rev. J. B. Wight, January 25, 1815; Sermon delivered at the Ordination of Rev. N. L. Frothingham, March 15, 1815; Sermon preached in Brattle Square, April 10, 1815; Sermon delivered at the installation of Rev. Dr. Richmond, Dorchester, June 25, 1817 and a Memoir of Rev. John Eliot, St. D.

[9] Levi Hedge, "Lines on the Death of Professor McKean," *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* (March 1899), p. 152.

[10] Widener Library, Harvard University.

terlined, rewritten, blotted, and in general reveal hard use. Changes in wording and thought that McKean made over an eight-year period are marked into his work on margins and between chapters. A few chapters, like Chapters XII and XIII on Internal and External Topics, are no more than outlines or lists of topics. In the case of some individual topics he did not bother to set down his definitions. The fact that McKean was at his best when speaking extemporaneously makes his written lectures of less value, because parts which were not written down may have had the greater merit.

McKean's style of writing and organization as a lecturer is uneven. At times his organization is clear and unified. In other lectures his outlines are confusing. The same criticism applies to sentence structure; his written composition, except for a few of his introductory lectures, is generally hurried and lacks polish. Nevertheless, these lectures as they exist are of value, particularly as examples of what was considered important to American speech making in the early nineteenth century. The table of contents of his lectures which follows provides a bird's-eye view of the subjects which concerned him:

Table of Contents

I Introductory Lecture.
II General View of the Subject of this Course of Lectures and Consideration of Objections.
III Rise and Progress of Oratory among the Ancients.
IV Biographical Sketches of Grecian Orators.
V A Biographical Sketch of Orators and Rhetoricians in the Latter Portion of Grecian History.
VI A Biographical Sketch of Some of the Most Distinguished Roman Orators and Rhetoricians.
VII Roman Orators and Rhetoricians after Cicero.
VIII To Explain the Nature and Objects of Oratory.
IX The Several Kinds of Oratory: Demonstrative, Deliberative and Judicial.
X Connection of Oratory with the Powers of the Human Mind.
XI Invention and Constituent Parts.
XII Internal Topics.
XIII External Topics.
XIV The State of the Controversy.
XV The Properties and Uses of Narration and Proposition.
XVI Arguments: Demonstrative.
XVII Arguments: Deliberative.
XVIII Arguments: Judicial.
XIX Character of an Orator.
XX Excitation of Passions.
XXI Disposition Properties and Uses of the Introduction.
XXII Introductory to New Class-Sketch of the Founder and foundation.
XXIII Confirmation and Confutation.
XXIV Properties and Uses of the Conclusion.
XXV Remarks on Digression, Transition and Amplification.
XXVI Of Elocution Generally—and Elegance.
XXVII Composition and its Constituent parts.
XXVIII Of Dignity and of Figurative Language Generally, its Origin, Uses and Laws.
XXIX Species of Primary Metaphor, Synechdoches, Metonomy and Irony.
XXX Sources of Tropes Especially from Sacred Topics.
XXXI Divisions of Style.
XXXII The Low Style.
XXXIII The Middle Style.
XXXIV The Sublime Style.
XXXV Style of Epistles and Dialogues.
XXXVI Style of History.
XXXVII Style of Poetry.
XXXVIII Style of Orations.
XXXIX Pronunciation.
XL On Sermons.
XLI "Non Posse Oratorem esse, nisi bonum virum."[11]

In the lectures McKean observed the rules of his office, perhaps even more rigorously than did the first Boylston

[11] I have compiled the table of contents from McKean's original lectures.

Professor. Indeed there are comments in the lectures that McKean was trying to follow original instructions. The statutes, adopted by the Harvard Corporation in 1804, read in part: "It shall be the principal duty of the said Professor to instruct the student of the several classes in the nature, excellence, and acquisition of the important art of Rhetoric in its most extended and comprehensive sense, or in the theory and practice of writing and speaking well, that is, with method, elegance, harmony, dignity, and energy."[12] Like his predecessor, McKean relied heavily on the classical rhetoricians. In addition to explaining classical rhetoric, however, the second Boylston Professor summarized the rhetorical works of his contemporaries. In Lecture III, "The Rise and Progress of Oratory among the Ancients," his faith in classical rhetoric is made clear:

> This [rhetoric] is one of the subjects of human attention in which the moderns have been contented to follow in the steps marked out by their illustrious predecessors of Greece and Rome. So judged those who prescribed this course of lectures which is on the exact plan of the system of Professor Ward, who candidly avows his full concurrence with the amiable and eloquent Fenelon, that to combine portions of Aristotle and Longinus with Cicero and Quintilian and to confirm their maxims by references to the purest authors of antiquity, would even now form the best system of oratory.[13]

The second Boylston Lecturer adopted Quintilian's definition of rhetoric because it corresponded with the definition of rhetoric stated in the statutes of his office, and because it was a definition satisfactory to him. However, McKean noted the definitions of rhetoric offered by Aristotle, Trapezuntius, and Cicero, and cited Vossius as one of Ward's chief sources:

> Professor Ward follows him [Vossius]in this as in most respects and defines oratory [*sic*] the art of speaking well upon any subject, in *order to persuade*. He [Ward] does not contemptuously wave the objections which have been urged against including this principle design in the definition of the art. Nor does he admit that the not infrequent failure to effect persuasion is any more decisive than to urge that because physicians are not always successful in curing diseases this therefore is not the end of the art of medicine.[14]

Further, after citing the definitions of oratory offered by John Lawson, Anthony Blackwell, George Campbell, Hugh Blair, and William Barron, McKean attempted to incorporate the similarities of the definitions of all the authorities he cited into one comprehensive definition:

> In the view now given of the nature of oratory, respecting which there is a near resemblance between all these writers in the most material respects, are implied its most important objects. It is the art of speaking well. This is with a view to some end; it is either to afford innocent and pure pleasure, or effect some important benefit. It is the art of persuasion; to accomplish this great purpose in the best manner, it must interest the attention, please the taste, inform the mind, and affect the heart.[15]

In short, Adams' successor made use of almost all of the available authorities on rhetoric to develop his lectures. He gave Greek and Roman rhetoricians great weight but held the works of the ancients up to the hotter if not brighter lights of those who followed them. In so doing McKean was the first of American theorists to fashion a comprehensive history of the development of the philosophy of rhetoric. McKean's favorite among contemporary rhetoricians was George Campbell. When referring to Campbell, he indicated that "To

[12] Article 4, "The Rules, Direction and Statutes of the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard College," MSS Harvard College Records, IV, 9ff., Harvard Archives.

[13] Lectures, p. 37.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

[15] Lectures, p. 95.

students he has rendered services second only to the great masters of antiquity. . . . It is not superfluous to recommend his *Philosophy of Rhetoric* not merely as an interesting and useful treatise to peruse but as an invaluable summary to study, to digest. This is one of the few books which really is what its title implies."[16]

The significance of McKean's discussion of the nature of oratory in light of both classical rhetoricians and contemporary British rhetoricians is difficult to pinpoint. His statement that Quintilian's definition, which was established in the statutes for the professorship, was "satisfactory" leaves something to be desired. Possibly McKean was not enthusiastic in his acceptance of Quintilian's definition. His admiration for Campbell leads one to believe that his emphasis of classical theory, so strongly expressed early in his lectures, was tempered by his exposure to the *Philosophy of Rhetoric*. McKean's addition of Campbell's "ends of speaking," phrased in terms of the audience, to the definitions cited from classical rhetoric, and his lecture on the powers of the human mind indicate that he was more than fulfilling the critic's role in his consideration of Campbell. Perhaps McKean chafed a bit at the dictates of his office which, however, his Puritan conscience led him to observe.

In any case McKean was one of the earliest of American rhetoricians to be influenced by British rhetoric of the late eighteenth century. Certainly he recognized the genius of classical theories and, with this in mind, he did as much as he could to point out the similarities among Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Ward, and Campbell.

Since John Quincy Adams rarely mentioned his British counterparts and then only to reject them, a subtle but clearcut difference regarding the approaches to their subject existed between the first and second Boylston Professors. There was on the other hand very little difference in the emphasis which each gave to the various aspects of rhetoric. McKean divided his discourse in almost exactly the same proportions as Adams. He devoted one lecture to the nature of oratory, ten to invention, six to organization, twelve to style, and one to pronunciation. In his coverage of style, McKean used greater elaboration than Adams by including lectures on the style of epistles and dialogues, history, poetry, and orations. His last lecture was a definite departure from the philosophy of Adams in that McKean accepted wholeheartedly the statement of Quintilian, "An orator is a good man skilled in the art of speaking." Since McKean did not attribute the origin of his ideas to Adams, it is sheer conjecture that he was directly influenced by the rhetoric of Adams. Both men were familiar with the same sources and it is likely that both arrived at some of the same conclusions independently. McKean was not the sort of man who would have used materials without quoting his sources. He was too scrupulous and too much the scholar to plagiarize.

Oral communication was the specific form of rhetoric with which McKean concerned himself both in theory and practice. Professor Hedge's reflections on his colleague's speaking as Boylston Lecturer reveal how effectively McKean made use of his fine mind in analyzing, synthesizing, and concisely abbreviating a wide diversity of materials for his students. Hedge said, "His publick lectures reflect honour on himself and the University. In these it was his aim to give condensed views of what . . . came under his notice. The different kinds of eloquence, with their characteristick properties and their appropriate rules,

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

were described with clearness and brevity . . . to produce a visible effect on his audience."[17]

In accomplishing his over-all purpose, McKean gave his students a number of hints on his methods in lecturing. His primary aim was to "adapt instructions to use by his audience."[18] He asked his students to expect a "plain, didactic" style of composition and a familiar manner of delivery. His students should raise questions and present an objective treatment of subjects which they discussed in declamations. He suggested that literature had been "too much associated with and influenced by the spirit of political and religious party,"[19] and pointed out that his students should "let none of the angry or turbulent passions of the world interrupt . . . quiet, disturb . . . harmony, . . . obscure judgment."[20] His students above all should be just and reverent as they approached their duties in the speech situation. In brief comments on orators of his time—Hamilton, Ames and Dexter—he accorded them praise. He referred to Logan, an Indian chief, as an example of the beauty of primitive oratory.

McKean applied faculty psychology to the speech. Following Campbell's lead, he discussed imagination, reasoning, and emotions as faculties to which the speaker should refer when he addressed an audience. The speaker's tool in affecting the understanding, said McKean, is logic, and rhetoric is the practical extension of logic. A study of poetry supplies the orator with an understanding of imagination which he can use in his speaking. Memory, he said, is not an essential requisite but an important auxiliary to good speaking. Rather than giving memory a separate treatment, he referred to it as a faculty of the mind. He gave the orator free rein in making use of allied fields. The orator combs the "sister sciences" and explores the "treasures of all the arts, in order to give vigour to his powers of reasoning, and . . . convince the minds of those whom he addresses."[21]

In summary, McKean's contributions to rhetorical theory were not made in originality of thought. His contribution was his method. He organized poorly at times, but he was the first of American rhetoricians to criticize in an organized manner a wide diversity of both classical and contemporary rhetorical theories.

3.

McKean's effect as a teacher of speech was limited to the classes he faced. Frothingham, his student, indicated that "no external proofs of his eminence stand forth to justify our partiality to a stranger's eye."[22] He said, further, "I should address a large and sorrowing audience, were I heard by all those students, who most highly revered and tenderly loved him."[23] McKean's rhetoric fell in the shadow of the first Boylston Professor, John Quincy Adams. Both men based their rhetorics on the rules for Boylston professors, but Adams' name and the quality of his rhetoric overshadowed McKean's. Like Adams, McKean had, for all practical needs, no impact on those who followed him in the Boylston Chair.

McKean had little influence on speech education in the United States. His rhetoric was presumed lost. His name was buried with his body in Havana, Cuba. It seems that his rhetoric met the same fate as his bones—discarded in the "indiscriminate heap in the corners" of the history of rhetorical theory.

[17] Hedge, *Eulogy*, p. 16.
[18] Lectures, p. 17.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[22] N. L. Frothingham, *Funeral Sermon* (Boston, 1818), p. 5.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

THE FORUM

DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

To the Editor:

In April, 1960, *QJS* published my letter carrying the endorsement of the Department of Speech of the effort of the faculty and the regents of the University of Wisconsin to get Congress to rid the National Defense Education Act of its "affidavit of disbelief" requirement. *QJS* published, also, an accompanying document explaining that we support the requirement of the familiar, respected oath of allegiance to the United States and stating why we believe in eliminating the affidavit. With information obtained from our UW committee, I wish in this letter to report the current status and chances of repeal legislation, to express some views on the merits of a possible bill, and to recommend some courses of action.

Status of Repeal: On June 15 last the Senate passed S.2929 as amended, being the repealer bill with the Prouty amendment. The bill as passed would have:

(1) repealed the requirement for the disclaimer affidavit altogether;

(2) made it unlawful for any person to "apply for or receive any grant, payment or loan under this Act (the N.D.E.A.) *while he is a member* of the Communist party or any other organization having for one of its purposes or objectives the seizure or overthrow of the government of the United States (or of any State or local government) by the use of force or violence, and has knowledge of such purpose or objective of that party or other organization;"

(3) made it unlawful for any person who within five years has been a member of such Party or other organization to apply under the Act unless his application is accompanied by a full sworn statement about such (former) membership;

(4) made it a Federal crime knowingly to violate subsection (2) or (3) above.

This amended bill, as stated, passed the Senate June 15. On June 22 the House Sub-Committee on Education held a one-day hearing on the Senate bill. President Pusey of Harvard was the principal witness. "As spokesman for the members of the Association of American Universities," he said, "we find acceptable Senator Prouty's change in the wording of the amendment under consideration," (that is to say, the Senate bill as passed) and urged the House to "now act quickly in the current session" to complete the repeal.

The House committee took no action before the recess for the national conventions, nor did it take any in the short session that followed the conventions. Since this bill of the old Congress is now dead, any effort aimed at repeal must begin anew.

Prospects: Although repeal is supported by President Eisenhower and by President-elect Kennedy, we believe that the chances in the new Congress which convenes on January 20, 1961, for a bill more favorable than the one that passed the Senate are virtually nil. The Senate has now considered the subject twice; it has passed a bill that most Senators regard as meeting our views in a reasonable way; the chance that it will do more later is remote. The Senate has from the beginning been more friendly to our position than the House.

Needless to say, we still believe that the disclaimer affidavit should be repealed outright. We object to the imposition of a requirement on students and other persons in education which is not imposed on other recipients of Federal aid. We object to the vagueness which still plagues the definition of organiza-

tions one should not belong to. We fear that students may be discouraged from joining any but innocuous organizations. But, we repeat, outright repeal is not a viable legislative alternative.

The practical choice before individual members of SAA and the faculties to which they may belong is, in our judgment, either repeal of the disclaimer affidavit with the Prouty Amendment or one substantially like it (the Senate bill that passed this year, outlined above), or no repeal.

Our Present View: On the alternative so stated we believe that the bill that passed the Senate is a very great improvement over no repeal. Our reasons are that the bill that passed the Senate:

(1) repeals entirely the requirement for the disclaimer affidavit;
(2) eliminates all inquiry into belief;
(3) makes illegality depend on overt acts; i.e., applying for money "while he is a member of the Communist party" or other organization described, or within five years thereafter without disclosure;
(4) limits the other organizations described to those whose purposes include the seizure or overthrow of government *by force or violence*, and eliminates the present language about "other unconstitutional *or illegal means*";
(5) limits offenders to those who "wilfully" violate the prohibitions stated, and to one who "has knowledge of such purpose or objective" of the organization of which he is a member;
(6) confides administration (by making it a criminal law) to the Department of Justice, United States attorneys, and Federal courts and juries throughout the country.

The last point is important. It means that if a person is thought to have committed a crime under this Act, the burden of proof will be on the government. The accused will have all the classic guarantees of justice in a Federal court. Moreover, the Department of Justice and individuals within it can win kudos only by winning the cases they bring. There are therefore strong incentives for responsible administration of any Federal criminal law, whichever party is in power.

Recommendation for Action: We urge individual members of SAA to communicate with members of the Senate and of the House whom they know asking for simple repeal of the affidavit of disbelief but indicating that a bill similar to S.2929 as amended would be satisfactory.

We urge SAA members who are part of collegiate or university faculties to ask for faculty action on repeal as recommended above. (As of April 30, 1960, 105 institutions of higher learning had publicly stated their disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit; 22 of them had refused to participate in part or in whole in the N.D.E.A. program because of the affidavit.)

We urge the Legislative Assembly to take action on repeal as recommended above at its meetings in December of 1960. SAA would find itself in excellent company. Among the educational associations which have urged the repeal of the affidavit are these: Committee A of AAUP, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, Association of American Law Schools, American Council on Education, Association for Higher Education (NEA), Association of American Colleges.

The persons it is important to reach are:

The two Senators and all the Congressmen from your state;
The Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor;
The Chairman of the House Sub-Committee on Education;
The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education.

To be most useful, communications

should reach the people named above before January 20, 1961.

FREDERICK W. HABERMAN
Chairman, Department of Speech
University of Wisconsin

NEA AND SAA

To the Editor:

Since 1939 the Speech Association has been a department of the National Education Association, an organization established in 1857 "to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of . . . education in the United States." Through this membership the SAA, together with twenty-nine other departments representing specialized subject-matters, is affiliated with an organization of nearly 670,000 members, or approximately fifty per cent of the total instructional staff in public elementary and secondary schools.

Although the SAA as an organization is a member of the NEA corporate body, NEA membership for individual SAA members has always been optional, although some departments have enrolled as many as ninety-five per cent of their members in the NEA. At the Los Angeles NEA Convention Article XI of the By-laws was revised, and now includes these provisions: *"The Constitution of each Department shall provide that it promote and urge NEA membership on the part of its members."* The Administrative Council has now directed the constitution revision committee to prepare an appropriate statement for inclusion in the SAA constitution. *"Each Department shall require elective officers to be members of the NEA."* By action of the Administrative Council, SAA officers are now enrolled in the NEA.

These two matters are reported here for the general interest of the SAA membership. Beyond mere reporting, however, the Administrative Council urges all members of SAA to give serious consideration to NEA membership. Through its divisions, commissions, councils, and committees the NEA speaks for the entire teaching profession in representations before federal, state, and local education agencies; it campaigns actively for higher teacher salaries, tax deductions for educational expenses, and additional exemption on retirement income; it provides field and consultant services to educational associations and to individual teachers in cases involving their job security, tenure rights, and civil or academic freedoms; it publishes the *NEA Journal* for all members, and numerous books and pamphlets dealing authoritatively with educational matters; and it offers instructional services through departments and divisions for all members of the teaching profession from kindergarten through adult education. As an example of its service *to the field of speech*, attention should be called to a special sixteen page section of the November, 1960, *NEA Journal*, featuring contributions by eight members of the SAA, and urging greater emphasis upon speech training in both elementary and secondary school curricula.

Membership in the NEA is $10.00 per year, and enrollment should be made through the Membership Division, National Education Association of the United States, 120 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

J. JEFFERY AUER
Executive Vice President, SAA
Indiana University

SAA CONVENTIONS—1915-1960

To the Editor:

It occurs to me that it might be useful to have on record a list of our association's national conventions. Here is the list.

The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking

1.	1915	November 25-27	Chicago
2.	1916	December 1-2	New York City
3.	1917	December 27-29	Chicago
	1918	(No Convention was held because of the war)	
4.	1919	December 29-31	Chicago
5.	1920	December 29-31	Cleveland, Ohio
6.	1921	December 28-30	Chicago
7.	1922	December 27-29	New York City

The National Association of Teachers of Speech

8.	1923	December 27-29	Cincinnati, Ohio
9.	1924	December 29-31	Evanston, Illinois
10.	1925	December 29-31	New York City
11.	1926	December 28-30	Chicago
12.	1927	December 28-30	Cincinnati, Ohio
13.	1928	December 27-29	Chicago
14.	1929	December 30, 31, Jan. 1	New York City
15.	1930	December 29-31	Chicago
16.	1931	December 28-30	Detroit
17.	1932	December 27-29	Los Angeles
18.	1933	December 27-29	New York City
19.	1934	December 27-29	New Orleans
20.	1935	December 30-31, Jan. 1	Chicago
21.	1936	December 29-31	St. Louis
22.	1937	December 27-31	New York City
23.	1938	December 27-29	Cleveland
24.	1939	December 27-29	Chicago
25.	1940	December 30-31, Jan. 1	Washington, D. C.
26.	1941	December 29-31	Detroit
27.	1942	December 28-30	Chicago
28.	1943	December 28-30	New York City
29.	1944	December 27-29	Chicago
30.	1945	December 27-29	Columbus, Ohio

Speech Association of America

31.	1946	December 30-31, Jan. 1	Chicago
32.	1947	December 29-31	Salt Lake City
33.	1948	December 28-30	Washington, D. C.
34.	1949	December 28-30	Chicago
35.	1950	December 27-30	New York City
36.	1951	December 27-29	Chicago
37.	1952	December 29-31	Cincinnati
38.	1953	December 28-30	New York City
39.	1954	December 28-30	Chicago
40.	1955	December 28-30	Los Angeles
41.	1956	December 28-30	Chicago
42.	1957	August 25-29	Boston
43.	1958	December 27-31	Chicago
44.	1959	December 27-30	Washington, D. C.
45.	1960	December 27-30	St. Louis

Chicago	17 years
New York City	9 years
Cincinnati, Ohio	3 years
Washington, D. C.	3 years
Cleveland	2 years
Detroit	2 years
Los Angeles	2 years
St. Louis	2 years
Boston	1 year
Columbus, Ohio	1 year
Evanston, Illinois	1 year
New Orleans	1 year
Salt Lake City	1 year

Robert C. Jeffrey
Executive Secretary, SAA
Indiana University

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

THE VOTER DECIDES

H. F. Harding

Every four years the American voter faces the problem of deciding which of the two major party candidates for President he will vote for. He needs help in deciding because by the rules of the game anything goes that will influence a man's reason or emotion.

Millions make up their minds when the candidates are selected at the conventions. For them the campaign speaking may be educational but more often it is boring if not wasted effort. These persons seldom take the trouble to study the issues, or the voting records and qualifications of the candidates, or the history of the party, or least of all the demands of the office of the Presidency.

But there are some citizens who still insist on studying the records and reflecting about the men before they vote. The seventeen books and pamphlets in this review are for these thoughtful independents or undecideds. In 1960 these are the persons (3% to 15%, depending on the period before November 8) who may have elected the President. In several key states Republicans and Democrats were evenly split before the undecideds were counted.

This year there has been no shortage of campaign biographies. Both Kennedy and Nixon have been dressed up or dressed down several times. The voters themselves have been analyzed, counted, grouped, reclassified, and their attitudes predicted in dozens of ways. Elmo Roper and George Gallup have been torn apart for their estimates of undecideds by the Alsop brothers. But poll-taking and prediction go on, with both parties buying the services.

An undecided voter could easily spend $100 for books designed to help him vote intelligently. He could not only buy all the books listed here, but he could subscribe to newspapers, news magazines, special reports, surveys, and dope sheets by the dozen. If he read them all he would be hopelessly confused. And if he listened to all the speeches of the candidates or even the four TV "Great Debates" he could still be in the dark. Such is the heat and blast of campaign oratory that it numbs the senses.

What is a poor voter to do? Unless he insists on taking the advice of his bartender or barber about the way to vote there are only two wise courses. One: Read *The New York Times* every day and study it on Sunday. Two: Read the special report of the *Congressional Quarterly* on *The Public Records of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson*—their lives, voting records, stands on issues, platform. There is a similar report for Richard M. Nixon and Henry Cabot Lodge.

There is nothing better for the scholar or the citizen than the "News of the Week" section of the Sunday *Times*

Mr. Harding, Professor of Speech, The Ohio State University, was editor of QJS, *1948-1950.*

with the weekly reports of the candidates' speaking, the reports from regions, the voters' reactions, the editorials and the columns by persons like James B. Reston and Arthur Krock. The Letters to the Editor in every issue of the *Times* are invariably of value. The *Times* Sunday *Magazine* has carried from March through October articles of high merit on the presidential campaign. It would be easy to make a students' handbook of the issues and the men from this single source.

For a philosophical understanding of American democracy the best recent background study is the Rockefeller Report edited by James A. Perkins. The sections on "The Consent of the Governed" and "The Power of the Democratic Idea" are cogent statements which every classroom teacher needs to read. "Democratic debate is a source of strength; it is wasteful only when the debaters put forward irresponsible or foolish views" (p. 73). The report ends with a plea for the individual to do his part and to carry his share of the public responsibility.

Dean Heller's little essay on the Presidency is scholarly and incisive. It is supported by the author's editorial work with President Truman on his memoirs and his careful evaluations of other writers. In fact the section, "A Personal Guide to Reading on the Presidency," is a most valuable addition to the book.

Professor Brown's study, *The People's Choice* is a review of campaign biographies from 1824 to the present. All kinds of interesting lore come to light. Indeed, a formula for producing the ideal candidate can be extracted from this study, which is sub-titled "The Presidential Image in the Campaign Biography." The indispensable elements for a candidate seem to be (1) spotless ancestry, preferably back to the Revolution or earlier, (2) happy childhood in a humble family, (3) a heroic turn as a citizen-soldier, and (4) "innocent apprenticeship in the evil world of politics usually at the insistence of the electorate."

White House Fever is a practical guide on how to run a campaign. If Bobby Kennedy has not read the book he could easily write a similar one—except his would lack the sly humor and an objective treatment of the Democratic candidates. The student of campaign speaking needs to have his mind refreshed by the chapter called "Mud and Thunder." It is a collection of dirty tricks of past campaigns.

Politics 1960 deals with the processes and the issues and consists of some fifty essays, articles, speeches by old hands, from Dwight D. Eisenhower, Dean Acheson, and Albert Schweitzer down to lowly college professors. Students of persuasion are sure to gain by a reading of Franz Alexander's essay on "Emotional Factors in Voting Behavior" and V. O. Key's "Campaign Techniques."

Politics U. S. A. is called "A Practical Guide to the Winning of Public Office." It starts with Senator Scott's essay on "How to Go into Politics" and ends with Jim Farley's little homily on "Friendship." It is indeed eminently practical, and Part Four on "Techniques of Modern Politics" should be required reading for every aspiring candidate. We are indebted to James M. Cannon, the editor, for discovering and selecting the twenty-three pieces that make up his book. Plato's Gorgias would recognize his art on every page.

The Voter's Presidential Handbook is dedicated to the independent voter who, "even if a member of a Political Party, does not blindly follow Party dogma or a Party Leader, but thinks for himself and votes for a candidate or proposition he believes best for all the people." The author is a New York

lawyer, a former Rhodes Scholar, and a devoted campaign worker and student of election reform. He deserves credit for compressing so much into 205 pages. The section on "Political Speeches" (pp. 125-128) is just a sketch of what needs to be written in more detail for all innocent listeners. Wells' two basic questions for listeners are "Who is talking?" and "What is being said?"

The two occasional papers by Stephen K. Bailey are contributions at the scholarly level. The nine proposals for reform which Bailey offers are a long way from attainment. But they are refreshing for their very idealism. The ones that need immediate consideration seem to me to include tax-supported national party financing, permanent advisory councils and staffs for both national committees, increasing the term of Representatives to four years and Senators to eight, and ways to develop "machinery for keeping an active roster of talented people for the important executive posts in national government."

The Republican and Democratic committees in 1960 have enlisted the services of writers and professors galore. Both candidates have written "white papers" as never before. Mr. Nixon's collection of speeches, *The Challenges We Face,* is a publisher's sampling of his speeches, or more descriptive, a collection of excerpts from speeches put together in composite form. Included is a version—not the authorized version, which has not yet been released—of the "Kitchen Debate" with Mr. Khrushchev. Bela Kornitzer's *The Real Nixon* and Joe McCarthy's *The Remarkable Kennedys* are carefully written, pleasant, but frankly slanted campaign pieces. They will be read by admirers and ignored by the detractors and forgotten by the public on the ninth of November. A more substantial work is *The Strategy of Peace,* edited by Allan Nevins. It is a collection of Kennedy's speeches and contains his famous address of June 14, 1960, in which he outlined his twelve-point foreign policy program. It is doubtful whether all these speeches will command the attention of rhetorical critics years hence. But they deserve close study now as guides to the thought processes of an ambitious man. He is inventive, resourceful as a stylist, and in spite of the buildup of the image, apparently a sincere man. This can seldom be said of his opponent when we carefully study his prose. Meg Greenfield did in a brilliant analysis in *The Reporter* (September 29, 1960) entitled "The Prose of Richard M. Nixon." This particular study when read by competent critics should provide enough ammunition to wreck the *ethos* of the man. Kennedy, meanwhile, the Pulitzer Prize winner for *Profiles in Courage,* rides along with his highly touted logographers. The Kennedy who gives his "basic speech" is quite another person.

One of Mr. Kennedy's trusted writers is Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. His book, published just a few weeks before the election, and put on the *Times* Best Seller List immediately, can hardly be called balanced or impartial. It isn't either. Can anybody close to a candidate be objective when the stakes are so high? Those who read the book must decide whether university professors and historians in particular should mess around on the sidelines or whether they should openly run for office themselves. This is a nice problem in conflicts of interests. He who writes for money, and as Samuel Johnson reminded us only "blockheads" don't, must have his objectivity evaluated in the court of public opinion.

I reserve for the last item the book-title of the person who is the key to all

elections, *The American Voter*. What is he like? Is he informed? Where does he live and work? What "motivates" him? Why does he shift his loyalties? Does he ask "who is best for the country?" or "who is best for me?" Four University of Michigan researchers have pondered baffling questions like these. In some twenty chapters they study the voter and what makes him tick. Much of the explanation of the data is hard to follow and many of the findings seem to be verifications of the obvious. Those who expect to find answers to the problem of whether campaign speeches influence voters will be disappointed. In fact the Index contains no references to speeches, speech-making, or speakers as such.

The book does reveal, however, in the words of individual voters, the subtle ways by which they make up their minds. The impressions that Nixon is a foreigner or that Eisenhower's looks are kindly or that Stevenson is smart are produced without words at all. Apparently the voter decides in devious ways by his age, his educational level, his economic and social status, his voting residence, and his own capacity to identify himself with the candidate. In fact the low percentage of voters who change parties in their lifetimes (about 20%), who give money or buy tickets or help the campaign (4%), or who attend the rallies and dinners (7%) makes one wonder whether it is really wise to get more voters registered. The great mass of the electorate seems incapable of following a prolonged chain of argument, to say nothing of detecting the subtle tricks of campaign speaking.

Campbell and his associates do not give us much encouragement about the capacity of the multitude to make good decisions. The TV debates nevertheless were supposed to help the undecideds decide. But did they do that? People, parties, issues, and candidates on TV screens do not guarantee a good way to select a wise leadership. "The typical voter has only a modest understanding of the specific issues and may be quite ignorant of matters of public policy that more sophisticated individuals might regard as very pressing. Our measures have shown the public's understanding of policy issues to be poorly developed even though these measures usually have referred to a general problem which might be the subject of legislation or (in the area of foreign affairs) executive action, rather than to particular bills or acts" (p. 542).

This review ends on a discouraging note because of the events of recent years. We need leaders who can explain the issues in simple terms, who can teach the politically illiterate, and who can awaken among the educated the desire to understand and take part. F. D. R. could do it and so could Teddy Roosevelt. In spite of all his learning, Woodrow Wilson was only a moderate success. As a speaker, Calvin Coolidge was a flop. Herbert Hoover in 1932 was no better. Adlai Stevenson had the gift in 1952. Will John F. Kennedy develop the capacity in the next four years and help us by enlightenment maintain peace with honor and preserve the United States from its enemies? I hope it takes much less than forty-eight months to know the answer.

BOOKS REVIEWED

THE CONDITION OF OUR NATIONAL PARTIES. By Stephen K. Bailey. New York: Fund for the Republic, 1959; pp. 24. Free.

ETHICS AND THE POLITICIAN. By Stephen K. Bailey. Santa Barbara, Cal.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1960; pp. 10. Free.

WHITE HOUSE FEVER. By Robert Bendiner. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1960; pp. 180. $3.75.

THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE. By W. Burlie Brown. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1960; pp. xiv+178. $4.00.

POLITICS U. S. A.: A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO THE WINNING OF PUBLIC OFFICE. Edited by James M. Cannon. New York: Doubleday, 1960; pp. xi+348. $4.95.

THE AMERICAN VOTER. By Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, Donald E. Stokes. New York: John Wiley, 1960; pp. vi+571. $8.50.

POLITICS 1960. Edited by Frances M. Carney and H. Frank Way, Jr. San Francisco: Wadsworth, 1960; pp. 266. $4.00.

THE PRESIDENCY: A MODERN PERSPECTIVE. By Frances H. Heller. New York: Random House, 1960; pp. 114. $0.95.

THE STRATEGY OF PEACE. By John F. Kennedy, edited by Allan Nevins. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. xv+233. $3.50.

THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF JOHN F. KENNEDY AND LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Supplement to Weekly Report of July 22, 1960 of the *Congressional Quarterly*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 1960; pp. 1273-1301. $1.00.

THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF RICHARD M. NIXON AND HENRY CABOT LODGE. Part II Supplementing Weekly Report No. 33 of *Congressional Quarterly*, August 12, 1960. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 1960; pp. 1394-1431. $1.00.

THE CHALLENGES WE FACE. Edited and Compiled from the Speeches and Papers of Richard M. Nixon. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. 253. $3.95.

THE POWER OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEA. Special Studies Project Report VI by a writing committee of which James A. Perkins was chairman. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1960; pp. 75. $0.75.

THE REAL NIXON. By Bela Kornitzer. New York: Rand, McNally, 1960; pp. 352. $3.95.

THE REMARKABLE KENNEDYS. By Joe McCarthy. New York: The Dial Press, 1960; pp. 190. $3.50.

KENNEDY OR NIXON: DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE? By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. New York: MacMillan, 1960; pp. 51. $1.95.

THE VOTER'S PRESIDENTIAL HANDBOOK. By John A. Wells. New York: McDowell, Obolensky, 1960; pp. 208. $1.45.

AMERICAN FORUM: SPEECHES ON HISTORIC ISSUES, 1788-1900. By Ernest J. Wrage and Barnet Baskerville. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. xii+377. $5.50.

American Forum contains twenty-six speeches by twenty-four men and one woman. Webster appears twice; Susan Anthony is the honored woman. Eighteen of the speeches are arranged in pairs under rubrics based on great national issues. Of the remaining eight, four are grouped under the heading, "The Basis of Political Society: A Spectrum of Views," and four under "A House Divided." The editors have provided essays sketching "the events and intellectual environment that constitute the backdrop of these speeches," and excellent lists of supplementary readings.

To hundreds of addresses exhumed "from crumbling pamphlets, from yellowing newspapers, from legislative debates and hearings, and from journals," the editors applied certain criteria. Negatively, they sought neither the consciously eloquent nor the allegedly influential, thereby rejecting the patterns that they attribute to most collections of speeches. Although some earlier anthologists might object to this cavalier simplification of their standards, Professor Wrage revealed by his extended review in the December, 1954, issue of this journal that he has earned the right to generalize about his predecessors. Positively, he and Professor Baskerville have endeavored to produce "the substance and framework of an American forum as a venture in intellectual history through public address," by juxtaposing speeches that represent men competing for acceptance of opposing ideas on constitutional, political, economic, social, and religious questions of enduring interest.

Probably no two historians would agree on the eleven most critical issues that split the public between 1788 and 1900, but those selected for this volume assuredly "commanded widespread public interest, provoked serious controversy, and continue directly or indirectly to challenge us today." A few, such as Woman Suffrage, might seem to possess only historical interest, but one needs merely a superficial acquaintance with current fictional, sociological, and psychiatric accounts of feminine unrest to realize that nothing much was settled by the Nineteenth Amendment.

The editors' declaration of independence impels one to discover to what extent they have adhered to the *de facto* canon of American orators. By my count, thirty-one of the thirty-nine speakers discussed in the three volumes of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address* fall within the period covered by *American Forum;* of the thirty-one, nine (Henry, Calhoun, Webster, Lincoln, Douglas, Ingersoll, Susan B. Anthony, Beveridge, and Bryan) are represented. More significant is the number of speeches that have already appeared

in widely-distributed collections. Confining the comparison to the 1900 edition of *Modern Eloquence,* to A. Craig Baird's *American Public Addresses* (1956), and to *American Speeches* (1954) by W. M. Parrish and Marie Hochmuth, we find that eight of the Wrage-Baskerville selections confirm earlier judgments. The eight are worth listing: Henry and Madison on ratification of the Constitution; Jefferson's First Inaugural; George Bancroft on the ultra-democratic Jacksonian philosophy ("The Office of the People in Art, Government, and Religion"); Channing's sermon at the ordination of Jared Sparks ("Unitarian Christianity"); Lincoln's "A House Divided"; Conwell's "Acres of Diamonds"; and Beveridge's "The March of the Flag." These hardy perennials may be, as the editors believe, the best statements available on the issues with which they deal. But is there a law against settling for the second best? My reactions to the duplications are no doubt idiosyncratic. I accept without *heart-burning* the speeches by Henry, Madison, and Lincoln. I am irritated by Bancroft's hieratic, magisterial tone, believe that the Jacksonian democracy might have been better represented, and stick to my prejudice despite William Jennings Bryan's enthusiasm for Bancroft. Much as I like Channing's famous sermon, I suspect that among the highly articulate Unitarians something almost equal to it might have been unearthed. And I unapologetically deplore the use of space for "Acres of Diamonds" and "The March of the Flag."

But enough of caviling; editors are entitled to a few old favorites when they provide so much that is unfamiliar. In view of the unsatisfactory character of surviving remnants of Susan Anthony's speeches, her testimony of March 7, 1884, before the Senate's Select Committee on Woman Suffrage is especially welcome. It is crisp, hard-boiled, fact-laden, richly-illustrated from personal experience, and not wholly humorless (a few are left, she says, who really believe that St. Paul would be unhappy if women are allowed to vote). But is she not too candid to be persuasive when she describes much of the male electorate as the denizens of grog-shops, brothels, and gambling halls, and too frank when she repeatedly links her cause to the temperance movement? Perhaps our fathers and grandfathers, defending their prerogatives until overwhelmed in 1920, knew precisely what the women were up to!

Robert Toombs, Henry Raymond, George Davis Herron, DeWitt Talmage and Joseph E. Brown are represented by speeches of varying merit but unfailing interest. Their names, though not household words, will be recognized, at least vaguely, by students of American history. The same can hardly be said for David Daggett, who prospered and pontificated for nearly ninety years. He appears here, with a Fourth of July oration delivered in 1799 at New Haven, as spokesman for the anti-democratic, anti-French, anti-Jeffersonian Federalists. Perhaps he *is* more urbane than Fisher Ames or Timothy Dwight, but his satire is on a par with that of most of the heavy-handed Hartford Wits. We welcome the resurrection of this literate relic as a reminder of the bitterness that developed during the first decades of the Republic. Thanks to Wrage and Baskerville, Daggett will have a new lease on fame, for few will forget the best thing about his speech, which is the title: "Sun-Beams May Be Extracted from Cucumbers, But the Process is Tedious."

Remarkable success has crowned the editorial effort to bring together speakers who clash. Many were indeed engaged in actual debate: Henry and Madison on the Constitution; Calhoun and Webster on the "Compact" theory of the Union; Lincoln and Douglas on "The House Divided"; Thaddeus Stevens and Henry Jarvis Raymond on Reconstruction; T. DeWitt Talmage and Ingersoll on religion. Many more of the paired addresses, although not closely connected by circumstance, represent opposing opinions so admirably that one appears to be responsive to the other. Among these are Lyman Beecher's 1823 sermon on "The Faith Once Delivered to the Saints" and Channing's 1819 exposition of Unitarianism; Robert Toombs' 1853 eulogy of slavery and Garrison's 1854 denunciation; and Bryan's splendid 1900 attack on imperialism and Beveridge's 1898 glorification of that now-tarnished doctrine. William Graham Sumner and Henry George, appearing together as representatives of "Rugged Individualism and Social Protest," are not closely related, but one can only welcome the appearance of these seminal figures in an anthology of speeches.

We are promised a second volume, featuring twentieth-century speeches. In it, I hope that the editors will expand the essays introducing each "Issue," on the flattering ground that what they have given us is so excellent that we want more. I hope also that when identifying the sources of texts, they will give the reasons, when a problem exists, for adopting the one that is reprinted. I am amazed at the lack of an index in *American Forum;* the next volume

should have one. Most important of all, I hope that the speeches may be printed without cutting. The editors share this hope: they started their present compilation with the thought that they would include only complete addresses. Defeated by the prolixity or exhaustiveness of nineteenth-century orators, they had to settle for a conscientious indication of omissions. They may have better luck with our less long-winded twentieth-century speakers.

The editors conclude their Preface to this admirable book by saying that they believe it constitutes "a lively chronicle of ideas in action, to be read with profit and enjoyment for its own sake, or as a source book in the history of American public address from 1788 to 1900." They are right.

NORMAN W. MATTIS
University of North Carolina

LEGACY OF SUPPRESSION: FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND PRESS IN EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY. By Leonard Levy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. xviii+353. $6.50.

Here is an iconoclastic approach to the history of freedom of expression in early America. Despite tradition, avers the author, colonial and revolutionary America did not provide a society in which freedom of speech and press was either a cherished theory or a common practice. Instead, the contemporary English example was followed. An authoritarian state maintained itself by means of strict enforcement of the common law of libel. Such is the thesis of the Dean of the Graduate School of Brandeis University, who, though untrained in formal law, is a recognized scholar in constitutional history. To its support he brings convincingly fresh and independent interpretation of old data and of some new; he provides a study of individual liberty *vs.* state control which belongs upon the reference shelf of every lover of civil and political liberty. He has immersed himself in the period. He provides detached understanding of his milieu. The intimacy of his grasp of materials and the copious documentation are proof that he has spared few efforts to this end.

The chief chapters, the second and fifth, reveal early colonial experience and the application of the common law to freedom of expression from the Revolution to the passage of the First Amendment. They assert with ample evidence that stringent federal and state statutes prevailed against the individual, that the Sedition Act of 1798 nearly stifled free speech and press, and that an American libertarian theory and practice did not emerge until the turn of the nineteenth century. Sources utilized include statutes, legislative debate, relevant cases, speeches, tracts, and letters. The author's nonconformist evaluations of the political theories of Milton, Locke, Tindal, Franklin, and Montesquieu are a distinct addition.

Dr. Levy's accepted test for free speech is: Does one have the right to talk openly and with impunity among one's neighbors? One would think its validity impaired by failure to include consideration of other interests, such as those of the neighbors and of the state. The author concludes that despite the contentious religious and political issues of the day, free expression was possible only in enclaves consisting solely of dissident minorities. The work could be improved in a future edition by a statement of the basic philosophical values found in liberty *vs.* suppression as stated by their proponents. Too, here and there, e.g., Chapter I, p. 7, footnotes 11 and 14, one finds reliance upon secondary authority for data available in the Journals of the Commons. A few cases of libel fundamental in their importance, e.g., that of Sedley in 1663, have been omitted. And Chapter Three, perhaps the weakest and certainly the shortest of the book, does not reveal the authority displayed in other chapters, particularly in discussion of the political views expressed in addresses of Pym, Hampden, Coke, Eliot, and St. John, among others.

The style is lucid and reveals the solid conceptions and phrasing which come, perhaps unconsciously, from long and intimate acquaintance with the ideas and language involved in the statement of great constitutional issues and decisions.

GEORGE P. RICE
Butler University

WILLIAM NAST: PATRIARCH OF GERMAN METHODISM. By Carl Wittke. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960; pp. viii+248. $4.95.

William Nast, the patriarch of German Methodism, resembled John Wesley in many respects. Like the founder of Methodism, he was a classical scholar, an internationally recognized theologian, an author, editor, teacher, and preacher. Born in Germany and educated at the University of Tübingen, Nast came to America in 1828 and five years later served as one of two faculty members in the preparatory department of Kenyon College. While at

Gambier, Nast was "born again" after a prolonged struggle, not unlike John Wesley's soul-searching torment prior to his Aldersgate conversion. If Irish historian Lecky was right in characterizing Wesley's heart-warming experience as an epoch in English history, William Nast's conversion marks an equally significant event for the German population in the Mississippi Valley which was soon to hear the new convert and his spiritual sons proclaim Methodist doctrine.

In spite of Methodist suspicion of the fun-loving, beer-drinking, Sabbath-breaking German immigrant, the Ohio Conference risked $100.00 in an experiment to stem the tide of "moral corruption that was landing on our shores," and commissioned Nast, first as missionary to the Germans in Cincinnati, and later to all of Ohio. Historian Carl Wittke, Dean of the Graduate School at Western Reserve University, tells the life story of this German Wesley sensitively and fairly, "wart and all," without apology or unnecessary comment. A recognized authority on immigrant groups in America, Wittke based his volume mainly on family papers and *Der Christliche Apologete*, German Methodism's official organ, which Nast founded in 1841 and edited until 1892. The author also reveals his complete understanding of Methodist history and the part the circuit riders, native and German, played in bringing order to the crude, often immoral frontier community.

The soft-spoken, shy Nast possessed neither the remarkable laryngeal stamina nor the love for horse flesh which marked the average circuit rider. Yet he managed to overcome insuperable obstacles, planted the seeds of Methodism among the German immigrants, lived to see his church grow to 63,000 members, and served as the first president of German Wallace College, which in 1913 merged with Baldwin University to form the present institution at Berea, Ohio. For those concerned with frontier rhetoric, church history, or the Americanization of the immigrant, Wittke's latest volume offers fascinating biographical reading and a perceptive analysis of a dedicated man's contribution to his people.

PAUL H. BOASE
Oberlin College

THE MIND AND SPIRIT OF JOHN PETER ALTGELD: SELECTED WRITINGS AND ADDRESSES. Edited by Henry M. Christman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960; pp. 183. $4.00.

John Altgeld was a prominent nineteenth-century liberal. He was born in Germany, lived in Ohio, Arkansas, and Missouri, and finally settled in Chicago as a lawyer and real estate operator. Clarence Darrow was his law partner; in fact, Altgeld was instrumental in bringing Darrow to Chicago from Ohio. Active in the Democratic Party, Altgeld became a Cook County superior court judge, and from 1892 to 1897 served as governor of Illinois. In 1896 and again in 1900, he helped to get the presidential nomination for William Jennings Bryan, had a strong hand in the formulation of the platforms on which Bryan ran, and campaigned vigorously for him throughout the nation.

Altgeld was an astute businessman, and by the early 1890's had become a millionaire. Much of this fortune later was spent in support of the political campaigns in which he participated. The Illinois governor was a leader in the movements for judicial and penal reform and for the improvement of the lot of the working man. He was a Jeffersonian Democrat, but also had the support of the United Labor Party and such labor leaders as Eugene Debs and George Schilling. He was closely associated with the major social reform programs of his time.

Altgeld wrote several books which brought him recognition from his contemporaries. *Our Penal Machinery and Its Victims* appeared in 1884 and *Live Questions*, a series of essays on legal, political, economic, and social issues, in 1890. In 1901, the year before his death, he published a book on public speaking entitled *Oratory: Its Requirements and Rewards*. It is a slim volume which offers standard advice in a series of epigrammatical statements.

The present volume contains ten of Altgeld's public statements on key social questions and a brief memorial address by Clarence Darrow. Seven of the ten statements are speeches. In the Preface, the editor traces and assesses Altgeld's career. The speeches deal with penal reform, education, labor problems, the gold standard, and a variety of other political issues. A surprisingly large number of Altgeld's ideas, considered "progressive" in his day, are now generally accepted. The speeches are direct in style, heavily supported with factual material, and sharply organized. For analyses of Altgeld's speaking consult the doctoral dissertations by Coleman Bender (University of Illinois, 1955) and Dana Woodbridge (Northwestern University, 1951), and the master's theses by Huber

Ellingsworth (State College of Washington, 1950) and Eugene Sloat (Northern Illinois State University, 1958).

ORVILLE HITCHCOCK
State University of Iowa

SUSAN B. ANTHONY: REBEL, CRUSADER, HUMANITARIAN. By Alma Lutz. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959; pp. xii+340. $5.75.

Alma Lutz's latest biography is a compact and penetrating study of woman's greatest champion. Of special merit is the author's demonstration of Miss Anthony's awakened interest in reform measures and her subsequent realization of the inferior position of women in society.

Despite obvious admiration for her subject, Miss Lutz tells her story in a temperate tone, resisting the temptation to overemphasize the more dramatic moments of her subject's life. The style is neat and scholarly, but somewhat unimaginative. One wishes that the book made a greater critical inquiry into the role played by Miss Anthony in the changing America in which she lived.

The book's essential value is biographical, although Miss Lutz makes scattered comments, based upon her extensive research, about Miss Anthony's speeches. The author describes the speeches as well-planned, usually brief, and to the point. She also demonstrates how Miss Anthony changed her method of preparation for her speeches during her career. Miss Anthony was seldom fully satisfied with her efforts on the lecture platform, and through her admiration for the great orators of the movement such as Elizabeth Stanton, Lucy Stone, and Anna Howard Shaw, she revealed a deep wish to be a superior orator, so that she might better serve her cause. She felt that her greatest service lay in planning and r-ganizing the many tours, campaigns, and conventions which were held in behalf of woman suffrage.

It seems appropriate that this biography should appear at a time in American history when the votes of women could outnumber those of men. The book is a welcome addition to the literature concerning the central figure of one of history's most interesting movements.

WILL LINKUGEL
The University of Kansas

IMPACT: ESSAYS ON IGNORANCE AND THE DECLINE OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION. By Ezra Pound. Chicago: Regnery, 1960; pp. xviii+285. $5.00.

Ezra Pound has a fixation: "One cannot understand history without a comprehension of economics." It is this idea that is restated throughout the series of eighteen essays in this volume. In the earliest piece, "Murder by Capital" (1933), Pound blames the economic system in America for "social, educational, and artistic evils." Twenty-seven years later, his criticism is the same. His economic theories intrude into every piece, no matter what the subject. A reader might be led to believe that Ezra Pound was an economist dabbling in the world of art, literature, and ideas. Why can't Pound tear himself away from his fixation? The answer is found in his essay, "The Enemy is Ignorant" (1944): "the whole of current taste in literature and the entire journalistic system are controlled by the international usurocracy, which aims at preserving intact the public's ignorance of the usurocratic system and its workings." And what is "usurocracy"? Pound calls it a system created by "traffickers in money . . . who create debts so they can enjoy interest on them, who create debts when money is cheaper in order to demand repayment when money is dear." Because of "usurocracy," he declares, wars are created, educational standards are held at a low level, and artistic taste and creativity are kept servile.

With his unique economic theory at the core of his philosophy, Pound scrutinizes all spheres of American civilization. "Bureaucracy" has taken hold of America since the "fall of the Republic," an event that occurred, according to Pound, after the Jefferson-Adams period in our history. He denies the validity of literary criticism because readers are not trained to read the original works with "sensibility." As a self-proclaimed individualist, intellectual, and semanticist, he stresses the need to integrate learning in various fields, believing that the specialist beclouds the real issues of our times. He cries for "personal integrity" and "sharp critical faculties" among our educators. Words must be devoid of "befouling" and "verbal fraud." Pound demands that educators stress "quality, not quantity," of learning. Students must not be burdened with "pseudo-literary produce." Rather, they should focus their attention on the "best models" and then "improve" upon them. "Intellectual filth can be toxic to the whole race," he warns.

One does not easily dismiss the writings of Ezra Pound. He is a man who has embedded himself in a world of economics and politics

He is a scholar, a translator, and a poet who has demonstrated his unique position as a universal man of letters. He writes with deep conviction but from a world of limited reference books and limited experience. From prejudice and partisanship, he is not immune. Writing succinctly and harshly, he makes no attempt to hide his convictions. Valid or not, his criticisms deserve the attention of our contemporary educators, to be read carefully, to be dissected, and to be accepted or discarded as befits the thinking of the reader.

MARVIN L. SEIGER
Hunter College

THE PASTORAL ART OF ROBERT FROST. By John F. Lynen. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960; pp. xii+208. $4.50.

HUMAN VALUES IN THE POETRY OF ROBERT FROST. By George W. Nitchie. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1960; pp. ix+242. $5.00.

Professor Nitchie, considering Frost in the perspective of "human values," concludes that there is an "uncertainty" in his affirmations and that his is a "fundamental indecisiveness." However, Frost's work is valuable proof that "poetry of less than absolute first rank need not mean incompetent poetry, or derivative poetry, or trivial poetry, or merely slick poetry." Frost also is important as "a kind of American culture hero," but that is a kind of hero who has, unfortunately, "'but a limited sense of what constitutes a difficulty.'" Wondering why Frost, a good poet, "is not a better poet," Nitchie concludes that, unlike Yeats, Frost lacks "a coherent theory of reality."

Professor Lynen, considering Frost's "art," concludes that his poetry "can best be understood by observing the method by which he has sought to make the present moment represent all other times, and the particular place he describes, the human situation as it has always existed. His essential technique is that of the pastoral. He has explored wide and manifold ranges of being by viewing reality within the mirror of the natural and unchanging world of rural life."

Although Nitchie studies meaning and Lynen studies art, each writer has been schooled in the modern critical procedures and so they patrol each other's territory with, ordinarily, graceful ease. Indeed, the most certain contribution of each writer is his expert reading of individual poems. It is also evident that, where their interests overlap, Lynen takes for an intricate complex of consciously handled artistic devices (the "pastoral art") that which Nitchie broadly hints is the poet's infantile urge to assert himself without opposition (the "Eden myth"). It is easy to say that these two books should be read by any close reader of Frost; both writers have read Frost seriously, conscientiously, and thoroughly. It is not so easy to evaluate the portion of truth in the argument of either book.

I shall pass by the question of whether Frost is really as indecisive as Mr. Nitchie thinks him. Even if he were, Nitchie seems to be as hard pressed as the rest of us to say any too clearly what's wrong with a "fundamental indecisiveness" in a poet's committing himself to a theory of reality. The best possible reason for finding such indecisiveness unsatisfactory would be that the poet was refusing to learn what everybody else knows is the truth about reality. Everybody does not know, of course. Nitchie is altogether too modest to suggest that *he* knows. So he falls back on what Yeats knew; but Nitchie does know enough about reality to know that if Yeats' theory was coherent, it was also "absurd." So far, on the assumption that being indecisive at least keeps one from being absurd, Frost would seem to be holding his own. Nitchie in effect retires to another position: having a coherent theory of reality enhanced Yeats' powers as a poet and, presumably, a coherent if absurd theory of reality would have improved Frost, too.

The view is tenable, surely, but it rather desperately depends on facts of a peculiarly imponderable sort. It is hard to talk about the Frost we *don't* have (Nitchie recognizes that, of course). True, the potato *might* have been larger, even to the point of absurdity, had it been planted on the other side of the garden, but there it is now on our plates, poor thing, and we must eat of it or go hungry. It is not much easier to talk about the Yeats we *do* have. Certainly we notice his wonderful growth as a poet. Many things happened to him during the course of his life and poetry and it is hard to seize on his fabrication of a coherent, absurd theory of reality as the principle of growth. We are led to the crucial question: Is sustained vision, a coherent theory, the *cause* of great poetry, or is it instead one of the usual manifestations of great poetry? If the latter, then we can probably say only that Frost is not a great poet because Frost is not a great poet.

Doubtless the crucial question is partly causal, partly semantic, and who knows how much

of it is unreal? I touch on it merely to suggest the central issues concerning belief in poetry which are studied and stimulatingly discussed by Professor Nitchie, and always in close connection with Frost's actual poetry.

As for Lynen's argument, perhaps we can say that it produces a Frost rather too ambiguous, ironical, and paradoxical to be quite true. It also produces some first-rate readings of individual poems, and a theory of conscious craft in Frost which cannot be lightly discarded. Certainly Lynen is closer to the truth in this matter than are those readers who enjoy thinking that Frost has no craft at all.

We should notice gratefully that if Lynen is perhaps overly "modernistic" in his Brooksian-Empsonian reading of Frost, he forcefully defends Frost from the most foolish, but the most persistent of the "modernist" heresies, that there is one and only one right poetic style these days. I like Professor Lynen's suggestion on this point, that essential modernity is a quality of mind, not of manner.

DON GEIGER
University of California, Berkeley

E. E. CUMMINGS: THE ART OF HIS POETRY. By Norman Friedman. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1960; pp. 195. $4.00.

Since Cummings has had his share of difficulties with unsympathetic critics, it is natural that such studies as the biography by Charles Norman, *The Magic Maker: E. E. Cummings* (1958), and the present critical analysis by Norman Friedman should defend the poet with warm affection. Surely Cummings deserves the affection. On the whole, there is much to be said for Rilke's observation—quoted with approval by Cummings himself, and in turn by Mr. Friedman on page 1 of the present study—that not criticism but only love can "grasp and hold and fairly judge" works of art. Nevertheless, a poet can be done in by his admirers, and there are times when Mr. Friedman's affection makes him a little suspect as a critic. It is also clear that he has a rather sharp quarrel with "some of our reigning critics" with respect to their constant emphasis upon verbal ambiguity, myth, ambivalence, irony, and symbolic tensions, and that he occasionally makes use of Cummings as a weapon with which to attack them. One may feel this to be an error in strategy even if one sympathizes with Friedman's position.

If these comments make Friedman seem, as a critic, rather youthful in tone, it is because that is the way the reviewer sees him. This is at once a virtue and a fault in the study. The book has the seriousness of approach to organization frequently encountered in doctoral dissertations; positions are outlined, defined, filled in with considerable vigor and purpose, though sometimes the end result is not quite the luminosity promised. The chapter headings suggest the effect: "Criticism," "Vision," "Action," "Voice," "Device," "Creation," "Growth." The matters Friedman considers are, of course, worth his consideration.

Any serious reader of Cummings will find the book very helpful. The critic's advice that we recognize in Cummings a delightfully lyrical poet who stands almost alone in a time when the elegiac note has become the convention of poetry is advice both worth giving and worth hearing. The chapters on Cummings' poetic personality and themes (Vision), his stances (Action), his vocabulary and diction (Voice), and his figures, metrics, and syntax (Device) are all useful and informative, and the explications of poems are sometimes striking. The chapter called "Creation," however, which attempts to "demonstrate Cummings' constructive and critical powers in operation," seems finally a failure, though it gives adequate testimony to the care exercised by Cummings in the act of writing.

WALLACE A. BACON
Northwestern University

DISCUSSION, CONFERENCE, AND GROUP PROCESS. By Halbert E. Gulley. New York: Henry Holt, 1960; pp. xii+388. $4.50.

This latest addition to our group discussion bookshelf preserves an anchorage in tradition while incorporating fresh insights into the dynamics of group communication. Discussion (and not all mutual talk is considered discussion) "occurs when a group with group orientation purposefully interacts orally for enlightenment or policy-determination." From this base, Gulley carefully develops the spirit and rationale of discussion, subjects amenable to collective consideration, guideposts for leadership and effective participation, and realistic tools for evaluation. He shuns a pitfall of writers less experienced who portray discussion as a thinking man's activity with debate a sort of rhetorical last resort. But the idiom of discussion itself seems to pit inquiry and critical thinking against advocacy and argument, and the author's ubiquitous "continuum" frequently begs the question it was designed to answer.

Gulley's treatment of interdependent thought will pleasantly surprise teachers resigned to mechanical intonation of John Dewey's observations. A provocative chapter on interaction in co-operative situations explores the dynamics of group thinking; abundant references and supplementary readings, with ample reliance on contemporary experimental studies, help to clarify or confirm basic concepts. Despite wide-ranging research by social scientists, empirical insights are yet needed for the bases of discussion theory: How do people think, individually and collectively? What is the most productive pattern of interactive thought? Which problem-solving systems yield the most reliable outcomes?

The text is steadied by sense of what discussion can and cannot do. A chapter on "Limitations of Discussion" warns against extravagent expectations or inevitable conclusions from the discussion process. To employ a procedure effectively, one must understand its capacities and also recognize its limitations. Gulley candidly appraises both. Readers may find the unit on research, "Becoming Informed," brief and perhaps late in the chapter sequence, especially as they soon meet an array of model discussion patterns in Chapter 10. Exercises are plentiful, motivating, and linked securely to theory.

This book, adaptable to classroom and conference alike, deserves wide attention: it is traditional without seeming stuffy, contemporary without being faddish. Interestingly written and stimulating to teachers no less than students, *Discussion, Conference, and Group Process* represents a sound contribution to the literature of group discussion.

James H. McBath
University of Southern California

A PICTURE HISTORY OF THE CINEMA. By Ernest Lindgren. London: Vista Books, 1960; pp. 160. 35s. ($4.90.)

"There are no fewer than 460 stills which have been selected and described by Ernest Lindgren, Curator of the National Film Archives, London, and Vice-President of the International Federation of Film Archives," reads the pre-publication advertising for this book. "No one, it is fair to say, knows more about the subject, and he has assistance from all over the world in producing this history of the cinema, comprehensive in its sweep, concise, factual and brilliantly illustrated." If that statement is as fair as its author assumes it to be, it is to be regretted that, with the largest still collection in the world at his disposal, in compiling this *Life*-like book Mr. Lindgren (with true British conservatism) invariably selected (regardless of the country or era under consideration) the tritest possible still from each film represented. Only in Part Ten, "A Universal Art (1947 to date)"—there has not been sufficient time for us to become weary of stills from the productions of that era—does one get away from the nagging feeling of "This is where I came in." Anyone who has ready access to the Blum, Griffith-Mayer, Rotha-Manvell, and Taylor albums might better save money and shelf-space than add this volume to his collection.

The illustrations are technically better reproductions than those in any similar anthology except *Movie Parade*. Typographically the book seems to be rather quaintly out-of-date; imitating the *Life* format did not go so far as to include the use of a contemporary font. Text and captions are deceptively authoritative; one feels that Mr. Lindgren writes not so much from having studied the films as from having made his own distillation of the better-known national film histories, which he does not cite, although he occasionally encloses a phrase in quotation marks without so much as hinting its provenience.

Quite probably these aspersions on Mr. Lindgren's words and pictures are an expression of the resentment I feel concerning the American films he has chosen as typical of the World War II and later eras. Nearly all of them suggest that the United States is one vast morass of corruption, frustration, fanaticism, or despair. The few British films that Mr. Lindgren has deemed worthy of mention (with the exception of *Room at the Top* and *Look Back in Anger*) tend to show that the Welfare State is the Best of All Possible Worlds. It is true, of course, that Mr. Lindgren is only reflecting production trends in the two countries, but I should like to see somewhere a note to the effect that the British Board of Film Censors will refuse a license to any picture which it fears might wound the tender sensibilities of the Establishment.

Henry L. Mueller
University of Illinois

DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN SLANG. Compiled and edited by Harold Wentworth and Stuart Berg Flexner. New York: Crowell, 1960; pp. xviii+669. $7.50.

Whether or not this is the "First Major Dictionary of American Slang Ever Pub-

lished," as the dust jacket proclaims, it's a jolly good job of dictionary making of its genre, backed by the sound lexicographical reputation of Wentworth. What will probably do more to make the cash register ring is the fact that "He [Mr. Flexner, who seems to have done the practical editing and writes the dispensable Preface and Introduction to Appendix] was able to include, for the first time in any dictionary, those derogatory and taboo words which play such an important part in American slang."

They're there, labeled [taboo] to protect the naïve, and many words labeled *colloq.*, and a few standard words "because many readers still consider them slang and will expect to find them here" *(serendipity?)*, as well as the run of what is commonly called slang. Over 8,000 entries, unfortunately for some items without pronunciation, with over 20,000 definitions. The plan is to give only meanings within the specified scope, so that, e.g., the primary references of the four-letter Anglo-Saxon words do not appear as glosses. There are slips, as for the least nocuous, not Anglo-Saxon, taboo, glossed as in all standard dictionaries.

Some of the glosses will not satisfy everyone, some perhaps not anyone. *Full of beans, full of hops, full of prunes* appear as one entry with interpretation and comment of doubtful accuracy in every detail. Some taboos are glossed by Latin terms needing the head word for translation. On the whole, however, the interpretations are of a pretty high level for works of this sort.

Many dates seem to overdo the planned emphasis on recency, especially *W. W. II* notation for what was current in World War I. The selected etymologies are as good as most etymologies. The illustrative quotations are in quantity more than ample, if occasionally too much revealing, as s.v. *blow a fuse*, where the quotation shows perfectly the basic metaphor ignored in the gloss.

The Appendix contains interesting word lists of patterns and group items. The Bibliography has more than 900 entries, of which close to a third are what appear to be primarily word lists. *American Speech* is the most cited source, for articles as well as lists. There are also many original sources, novels, newspaper columns, etc. by slang-using authors, and a sprinkling of standard works on language, etc. Many familiar names and impressive.

LEE S. HULTZÉN
University of Illinois

THE PRONUNCIATION OF AMERICAN ENGLISH: AN INTRODUCTION TO PHONETICS. By Arthur J. Bronstein. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960; pp. xvi+320. $5.00.

PHONETICS: THEORY AND APPLICATION TO SPEECH IMPROVEMENT. By James Carrell and William R. Tiffany. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. xvi+361. $7.75.

The concepts presented in Arthur Bronstein's book show how far the study of phonetics has travelled in America since the middle twenties, when the first theses in the area appeared. In those early years of the speech discipline, phonetics was thought of as a tool for use in fundamentals courses, or as an aid for the details of speech therapy. As such, it was often thoroughly hated and feared by students as a dry and difficult subject. The broader viewpoint—that phonetics can be taught as a liberal subject in itself, displaying the magnificence of the oral English language as ably as a study of literature can set forth the written language—people in speech have learned from descriptive linguists. Bronstein's book takes the new approach. It is suited to the general speech student who wants breadth in the field. It ought to be studied also by all English majors in American colleges. The brief history of our language in the Appendix is well done and very useful. In the second part of the Appendix, Bronstein has undertaken the knotty problem of setting down and putting into relationship with one another various phonetic and phonemic notations used by speech and linguistics scholars in America—a bit of spade work that has been badly needed.

Although it is somewhat more in the traditional pattern of phonetics texts, the Carrell and Tiffany book shows its authors to be up-to-date in respect to the findings of linguistics and versed in modern methods of analysis. It is aimed rather definitely at the work of speech therapy and speech improvement, although the authors state in their Preface that they have foreign students as well as American students in mind. They take cognizance of the liberal possibilities of their subject when they say "it would be gratifying to think that there may be some who would like to know about this aspect of their language as a matter of general culture." The aim of the text is practical as shown by the statement that "we have tried . . . to make this text a 'do it yourself' book. . . . We frankly should like to feel that a student who reads this book

and follows its counsel can, with no other help, become a better and more effective speaker."

The two books are alike in the thorough preparation and background of their authors, but different in that purposes are far apart; the Bronstein text presents American English in its many regional aspects, and the Carrell and Tiffany text is a book of exposition and practice material so clear in nature that a student may work at his own speed in self-improvement.

In bibliographical material, both books are excellent. Bronstein relates his references to specific research; Carrell and Tiffany give only general references to books and journals. Bronstein includes a survey of methods of marking intonation and associated phenomena; Carrell and Tiffany capitalize upon well-selected and well-presented practice material. All in all, the books complement each other and make a combined review possible.

ELIZABETH B. CARR
University of Hawaii

ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF SPEECH. By Harold M. Kaplan. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. x+365. $8.50.

This book by the head of the Department of Physiology at Southern Illinois University treats the structure and function of the vocal apparatus just as a textbook on general anatomy and physiology treats its subject matter for the medical student. It represents a successful attempt to codify all the known facts concerning the sensory and motor aspects of voice production, with the emphasis on theory rather than on applications.

In twelve chapters, the author covers the voice mechanism with its nervous and endocrine regulators; the structures for respiration, phonation, and articulation; and the auditory receptor system. An excellent Glossary, a complete Bibliography, and a helpful Index are appended to the body of the text. The illustrations are clear and adequate.

The author's competence is manifest on every page and his book is an invaluable addition to the literature of voice science. It is well planned and admirably written. It is not an elementary text; it seems too detailed and advanced for use below the junior or senior level.

It is not a little embarrassing to have such an excellent discussion of technical material furnished to the speech field by one who, in a sense, is an outsider. Nevertheless, teachers of speech, especially clinicians and therapists, should be grateful for this contribution and should appropriate it and use it.

It may be regretted that Professor Kaplan seems to conceive of *speech* and *voice* as identical. This point of view is distressingly prevalent, but thoughtful workers in the field of speech insist that a clear differentiation between the two terms serves the useful function of indicating that *speech* properly includes much more than *voice*.

A. T. WEAVER
University of Wisconsin

RE-ESTABLISHING THE SPEECH PROFESSION: THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS. Edited by Robert T. Oliver and Marvin G. Bauer. New York: Speech Association of the Eastern States, 1959; pp. 100. Paper $1.50. Order from Wiley C. Bowyer, Executive Secretary, SAES, Mineola Public Schools, Mineola, N. Y.

The twenty-two articles that make up this booklet are divided among the areas of rhetoric and public address, speech sciences, speech education, theatre and drama, oral interpretation, and radio and television. Generally, the writers have told the history of a particular area of speech from 1909 to 1959, the first fifty years of the Speech Association of the Eastern States. The reader will find little duplication of material in *History of Speech Education in America;* the more recent developments described in this booklet make it a useful addition to the libraries of teachers of speech and especially of directors of graduate studies.

Among the best papers are Carroll Arnold's "Rhetoric in America Since 1900," John Gassner's "Theory and Practice in Modern Theatre," Edward Cole's "Technical Development in the Theatre," Robert West's "History of the Specialties of the Speech Sciences," Jon Eisenson's "Highlights in the Study of Aphasia," C. K. Thomas's "Fifty Years of Phonetics," and Charles Seipman's "Broadcasting and the Public Interest."

The lack of any unified focus of attention detracts to some degree; one wonders why some of the papers—interesting in themselves—were included in a history. Moreover, a few writers tend merely to list authors and texts rather than to provide interpretation. Despite these weaknesses and some unfortunate typographical errors, the papers contribute to a knowledge of our profession.

Is it captious to object to Professor Zelko's

use of the word *rhetoric* in his article entitled "Emergence of a Rhetoric of Discussion"? If rhetoric is to have a precise meaning anywhere, should not teachers of speech use it with discretion? What is a "rhetoric of discussion"?

FRANCES LEA MCCURDY
University of Missouri

RECOGNITION OF EXCELLENCE. WORKING PAPERS OF THE EDGAR STERN FAMILY FUND. By Adam Yarmolinsky and others. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960; pp. xii+354. $3.25.

Since 1958, the Edgar Stern Family Fund "has concerned itself with means of increasing the value placed upon mind and spirit in this country." The first step was a conference of twenty-one distinguished persons at Princeton to consider such questions as: What is excellence? How is excellence stimulated? Who are the discoverers of excellence, and how may they be rewarded? How can the cultural climate of our country be changed? What honors would enhance excellence in America? This book contains a brief summary of the ideas of conference members on these questions.

The second step was to commission Adam Yarmolinsky as consultant to the Foundation to write a report on the identification, nurturing, and channeling of excellence and potential excellence in young people. Section two of the book consists of his highly intelligent, widely informed and brilliant summary of the current methods of stimulating, recognizing, and rewarding excellence in the home, the elementary school, the high school and college. He also includes a note on the motivation of the talented in the Soviet Union and in western Europe. And finally he discusses the techniques of major institutions for the recognition of mature excellence, such as the Nobel prizes and the various national academies. He concludes that rewards for mature excellence are now adequate, and that the Stern Foundation should turn its attention to the young. His survey of the current increase in awards, prizes, scholarships, fellowships, and special courses for the gifted, together with his comments on problems that arise in connection with them, is most enlightening.

Mr. Yarmolinsky's paper was submitted to a second, smaller group of consultants for use in preparing additional observations. These form the third part of the book. The suggestions are in many cases fundamental to a philosophy of education. The reactions of Professor Nevitt Sanford are of special significance for teachers of rhetoric and speech:

> In present circumstances a man without a specialty has no place to go. . . . different members of the Department of Speech at one of our large universities were trained in such diverse fields as philosophy, law, sociology, English, psychology, anthropology, and history. Each department member undertakes to carry on scholarly work. The Department is not a very happy one. It has been described as an aggregation of displaced persons. Much of the scholarly work that has been done bridges two or more fields, but recognition can come from only one, and our disciplines are rarely interested in bridging activities. So should we not assume that each discipline will take care of its own and that in a fresh consideration of awards we should give major attention to activities that do not fit into existing disciplines . . . ?
>
> as a matter of fact the liberal colleges still speak as if they sought to develop a man whose knowledge was in some sense general and all of a piece. Who in our society represents such an ideal? . . . I should say that the biggest reward of all should go to the person who best represents in his life and work the wholeness of western culture.

All of this seems to support what has been said in this journal and elsewhere about the vital connection between rhetoric and general education, and the need of each for the support of the other if there is to be any recognition of this type of excellence now so neglected.

EVERETT HUNT
Swarthmore College, Emeritus

BRIEFLY NOTED

BIBLIOGRAPHY SUPPLEMENT. Edited by Richard M. Ludwig. Supplement to the LITERARY HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. Edited by Robert E. Spiller, Willard Thorp, Thomas H. Johnson, and Henry Seidel Canby. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. xx+268. $8.50.

This supplement to Volume III of the Spiller, Thorp, Johnson, Canby *Literary History* brings bibliographical listings up to the early months of 1958. Of particular interest to the student of American speech and theatre are sections on "Resources," "Drama," "The American Lan-

guage," "Folk Tales and Humor," and "Oratory and the Lyceum." The bibliographies of 175 writers have been expanded and bibliographies of sixteen recent authors have been added. Despite its length, the volume is nevertheless a *selective* bibliography.

In scrutinizing the entries, speech scholars will be dismayed to find only scattered references to *ETJ* and *QJS* and none at all to *Speech Monographs*. In some instances, the bibliographer may have overlooked important items, but in most cases the fault lies in a discouragingly limited scholarship. Students of speech and theatre should strive for a better representation in the next supplement some ten years hence.

R. G. G.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN GOES TO NEW YORK. By Andrew A. Freeman. New York: Coward-McCann, 1960; pp. 160. $3.95.

This book describes Lincoln's trip to New York in February, 1860, when he delivered his famous Cooper's Institute address. Freeman reconstructs the three-day visit of Lincoln which the author contends "revealed an unusual aspect of the otherwise massive Lincoln scholarship." His story includes a description of how New York and Lincoln looked to each other, a biographical sketch of the rustic from Illinois, a brief review of his rise in the political world, what Lincoln did before giving the speech, the actual delivery of his talk, and an epilogue outlining the response from his immediate and remote audience. An Appendix reproduces the speech in full, and eight pages of notes indicate the sources used.

Unfortunately, the student of public address will find the study of Lincoln's speech style too general; it attempts no useful or provocative analysis of Lincoln's rhetoric; it fails to evaluate the significance of this address either as a part of the pre-Civil War debate or as a factor in making Lincoln President. Although the style is remarkably clear and effective, the book is not definitive nor as good as Benjamin Barondess's *Three Lincoln Masterpieces*, which covers the same speech.

C. David Tompkins
University of Wisconsin

SPEECH DEVELOPMENT, IMPROVEMENT, AND CORRECTION: METHODS AND MATERIALS FOR THE CLASSROOM TEACHER AND THE SPEECH THERAPIST. By Lucile Cypreansen, John H. Wiley, and Leroy T. Laase. New York: Ronald, 1959; pp. viii+353. $5.00.

This textbook is written for the classroom teacher and for the beginning speech therapist. For the former, it does not serve its purpose. It contains too much that would be of little value or interest to the classroom teacher who cannot be expected to become a specialist in all of her many fields of endeavor. For the beginning therapist it comes closer to achieving its goal. The book treats too many subjects in too cursory a fashion (the child who stutters, for example, is handled in about six pages). It is clearly and logically organized. It defines unfamiliar terms in simple, concise language. It introduces the reader to the vast body of literature in the field by citing generously from many studies throughout the text. Bibliographies at the end of chapters are extensive, and the references found in Appendix B are of value to anyone doing work in speech correction. Part III on "Methods and Graded Materials" gives the young correctionist a good supply of ideas for using such activities as speech games, creative play, and choral speaking as means to the end of better speech.

It is too bad that these authors have aimed at two targets simultaneously, because in so doing they have hit neither one dead center.

Kenneth Burns
University of Illinois

SPEECH IN THE CLASSROOM. By Donald H. Ecroyd. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960; pp. vi+152. $3.95.

With the basic assumption that every classroom teacher teaches speech, Donald Ecroyd has written *Speech in the Classroom* with a twofold aim, to improve the teacher's speech, and to provide insight into the speech problems of elementary and secondary students. The first section of the text, "Fundamentals of Effective Speech," includes voice, diction, bodily activity, materials, and organization. Section Two discusses the teacher's speech in such varied situations as oral reading, story telling, expository speaking, demonstrations, leading discussions, and conferences with students and parents. Section Three, only twenty-three pages long, considers aiding the speech handicapped and helping students with superior speech skills, with a final chapter entitled "Speech Can and Should Be Taught by Every Teacher."

The material is simple, accurate, and clearly stated. Each chapter concludes with a summary, exercises, study questions, suggested activities, and a bibliography of supplementary material. These additional readings are well-selected to

challenge the adult reader. In make-up, the book is well-designed and includes illustrative drawings by the author's mother.

Clearly, this is not a text for speech majors. It should, however, be valuable in those courses which share the author's aims of improving the teacher's speech and alerting him to his students' speech needs.

MARY LOUISE GEHRING
Stetson University

MANUAL FOR THE APHASIA PATIENT. By Mary C. Longerich, with a Foreword by J. M. Nielsen. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. x+277. Paper $4.75.

Manual for the Aphasia Patient is divided into three parts. In Part One, the author out lines some general and specific ways in which the family may help the aphasic patient to adjust to his environment. Part Two contains approaches and techniques for the aphasia therapist's use. Part Three consists of drills for the patient. These are printed on perforated paper so that the pages used in a particular session may be removed and inserted into a loose-leaf notebook.

The drills are divided into "Drills For Receptive Aphasia" and "Drills For Expressive Aphasia." To this reviewer, it seems that grouping together the drills for auditory retention span, for naming, and for the like would have been more useful. The drills and directions for use stress the visual area. This emphasis makes the drills more appropriate for patients who have less visual than auditory impairment.

The aphasia therapist will find this book provides a convenient source of ready material which, with some imagination, can be modified in innumerable ways to fit the particular needs of an aphasic patient.

MARGARET L. STOICHEFF
State University of Iowa

LEARNING TO TALK: A PARENT'S GUIDE FOR THE FIRST FIVE YEARS. By Margaret C. L. Greene. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. 90. $2.50.

Here is a book which parents can understand without the help and explanation of a specialist. It is a book from which parents will derive enjoyment as well as a harvest of helpful information. Since the information is sound, the speech therapist can put the book into the hands of parents with confidence.

The author presents the "play way" to speech development for the child and a positive uninvolved program for the parent. The theme is that parents should enjoy their child and the stages of development he passes through, particularly those related to speech. A chapter is devoted to each year between birth and five. What parents can normally expect from their child is discussed with a warning that the information is an average and that children vary in their development.

Mrs. Greene, an English speech therapist and mother of two daughters, distinguishes between baby talk and nursery words. She outlines the differences between the two and sets limits without becoming academic. She discusses almost every phase of the child's growth, emphasizing the importance to speech of muscle development, toilet training, feeding, and discipline. There is a foreword by Charles Van Riper, some clever drawings, a suggested reading list, and a form for recording milestones in the baby's life. The important thing about this book, however, is its invitation to parents to enjoy their child and to assist him in his difficult task of becoming a human being through speech.

C. MITCHELL CARNELL, JR.
Cerebral Palsy Center of Greater Baton Rouge

MODERN THEATRE PRACTICE: A HANDBOOK OF PLAY PRODUCTION. By Hubert C. Heffner, Samuel Selden, Hunton D. Sellman, with an Appendix on Costume and Make-up by Fairfax Proudfit Walkup. (Fourth edition.) New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1959; pp. xxiii+662. $7.00.

Modern Theatre Practice was first issued a quarter of a century ago, reissued in 1939, and considerably revised and expanded seven years later. The new fourth edition should meet our present needs as successfully as its predecessor met those of 1946.

Professor Heffner's contribution is now divided into two parts: "The Arts of Theatre and Drama" and "The Director and Directing." In each of them, he demonstrates his awareness of the changes that have occurred in the past fifteen years, both in theory and technique. His ideas are based in sound historical knowledge but they are modern in their approach. This is especially evident whenever he deals with problems of interpretation.

Professor Heffner has given his section a thorough rewriting which has been augmented by ninety-nine pages. This is not padding.

Heffner's prose is as succinct as ever. Especially to be commended is his remarkably lucid treatment of the difficult subject of play analysis.

Most of the practical matter on directing of the previous edition has been retained, including the useful schedule for production conferences and the admirably designed schedule of regular rehearsals. Material on the important, but sadly neglected subject of "coaching" has been incorporated into a chapter titled "The Director and the Actor."

The section on stage scenery by Professor Selden remains, as it has been since the first edition in 1935, a thorough, clearly written, practical manual based on the best orthodox practice. He does, however, contribute some new matter. Especially useful is a set of designer's working drawings and considerable new material on color. He has added two pages on scenery for arena theatre and for television, but that is not enough to be of practical help. It seems odd that a book which carries the word "modern" in its title does not mention synchronous winch systems of flying. So little that is new has occurred in stage scenery practice in the last quarter century, that I wonder at Professor Selden's omission of any new development.

It is, of course, in the field of stage lighting that our older play production books have become pathetically outmoded. Professor Sellman has wisely retained instruction in the use of the older instruments and devices which many educational theatres must still employ. But he has paid considerable heed to such developments as electronic and magnetic amplifier controls. I wish, however, that he had been more detailed in his discussion of the revolutionary silicon rectifier dimmer.

Definitions of lighting terms have been added, and wisely incorporated into an extensive and clearly stated glossary of scenic and lighting terms placed near the end of the book. Mrs. Walkup's brief but useful appendixes on costume and makeup have been retained without change.

One of the admirable features of the third edition was its annotated bibliography. The making of bibliographies has become increasingly difficult because of the tremendous increase in theatre publication within the past two decades. In the Preface of the new edition, the authors say that they "have attempted to select judiciously." Although on the whole they have done so, no bibliography is free of sins of commission and omission.

It is unfortunate, for instance, that in several cases the edition listed is one long out-of-print rather than the in-print edition. For example, Craig's *On the Art of the Theatre* is cited in the out-of-print 1925 edition. But a new edition is in print (New York, 1957). The same is true of Stanislavski's *My Life In Art*. There are two editions of it in print—one an inexpensive paperback published in the United States (New York, 1956), the other a new translation into English published in Moscow. The only edition of this important work listed in the bibliography is the out-of-print 1927 edition.

I wonder about the omission of such important recent books as Ronald Peacock's *The Art of Drama* (London, 1957) and Philip A. Coggin's *Drama and Education* (London, 1956). But I am grateful for the inclusion of many other useful British books. With the present seething interest in "The Method" I think it odd that Robert Lewis's brilliant exposition, *Method—or Madness?*, is not listed. It seems strange that although a book about Rudolf Laban's dance notation system is included, his own book, *The Mastery of Movement on the Stage*, is left out. It is startling to read in the annotations that H. W. Whanslaw's *Everybody's Theatre* is "a brief general guide to direction and production" and that his *Bankside Stage Book* consists of "hints on staging Shakespeare." Actually, the first is a book of instructions on how to make a children's toy theatre and the second one a book on how to make a model of an Elizabethan stage!

My main quarrel with the bibliography, however, is that it ignores a score or more of inexpensive paperback editions of important works on the theatre previously out of print or very costly. This sort of omission makes the bibliography seem somwhat behind the times.

Modern Theatre Practice is a substantially made and typographically pleasing book, worthy in its physical aspects of the importance of its contents. Let us hope, however, that its authors will not wait until 1974 before they bring out a fifth edition, revised.

JOHN WESLEY SWANSON
University of Illinois

PLAYWRIGHTS ON PLAYWRITING: THE MEANING AND MAKING OF MODERN DRAMA FROM IBSEN TO IONESCO. Edited by Toby Cole. New York: Hill and Wang, 1960; pp xx+299. $3.95.

Thanks to Toby Cole, it is now possible to examine the theories of important modern dramatists in one volume. She has assembled both familiar and ought-to-be familiar materials from widely scattered sources: Arthur Miller's Introduction to his *Collected Plays* and Garcia Lorca's declaration of faith in the theatre; Zola's defense of naturalism and Brecht's "A Short Organum for the Theatre." She has collected not only theories, but in a second part, exciting samples of the practical result: Ibsen's notes for *Hedda Gabler*, and O'Neill's explanation of *The Hairy Ape;* Synge's Preface to *The Playboy of the Western World*, and Ionesco's thoughts about *The Bald Soprano*. The usefulness of the anthology is enhanced by John Gassner's introduction, which effectively explains and relates the various cross-currents of modern drama, and by a brief but stimulating bibliography.

WILFRED P. CASCIATO
State University of New York, New Paltz

BOOKS RECEIVED

HAMLET AND OTHER TRAGEDIES OLD AND NEW. Edited by Helen E. Harding New York: Noble and Noble, 1951; pp. viii+486. Text $1.92.

SILAS MARNER. By George Eliot. THE PEARL. By John Steinbeck. Edited by Jay E. Greene. New York: Noble and Noble, 1953; pp. xxviii+451. Text $1.92.

IDYLLS OF THE KING. By Alfred, Lord Tennyson. THE KING'S HENCHMAN. By Edna St. Vincent Millay. Edited by Edith M. Ward and Edward G. Bernard. New York: Noble and Noble, 1957; pp. viii+341. Text $1.92.

JULIUS CAESAR. By William Shakespeare. ELIZABETH THE QUEEN. By Maxwell Anderson. Edited by Helen E. Harding. New York: Noble and Noble, 1958; pp. xii+338. Text $1.92.

MACBETH. By William Shakespeare. THE EMPEROR JONES. By Eugene O'Neill. Edited by Benjamin A. Heydrick and Alfred A. May. New York: Noble and Noble, 1958; pp. x+276. Text $1.92.

COMPARATIVE COMEDIES PRESENT AND PAST. . . . Edited by Rowena Keith Keyes and Helen M. Roth. New York: Noble and Noble, 1957; pp. x+630. Text $1.92.

COMPARATIVE ESSAYS PRESENT AND PAST. Edited by Warren W. Read. (Revised and enlarged edition.) New York: Noble and Noble, 1953; pp. xx+477. Text $1.92.

ROMEO AND JULIET. By William Shakespeare. CYRANO DE BERGERAC. By Edmond Rostand, translated by Howard Thayer Kingsbury. Edited by Thomas L. Doyle and M. David Hoffman. New York: Noble and Noble, 1958; pp. x+482. Text $1.92.

A CENTURY OF HUMOROUS VERSE 1850-1950. Edited by Roger Lancelyn Green. (Everyman's Library.) New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959; pp. xxiv+289. $1.95.

THE CHANGELING. By Thomas Middleton and William Rowley. Edited by N. W. Bawcutt. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958; pp. lxviii+140. $3.50.

CHRISTMAS PLAYS AND PROGRAMS: A COLLECTION OF ROYALTY-FREE PLAYS, PLAYLETS, CHORAL READINGS, POEMS, SONGS, AND GAMES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE. By Aileen Fisher. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1960; pp. x+344. $5.00.

ONE-ACT PLAYS FOR YOUNG ACTORS: A COLLECTION OF FARCES, COMEDIES, MYSTERIES, AND DRAMAS FOR STAGE AND STUDY. By John Murray. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison, 1959; pp. 336. $3.95.

AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNIQUES IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. By Theodore Huebener. New York: New York University Press, 1960; pp. xii+163. $3.25.

WHEN YOU STUDY THE POEM. By Ruth R. Haun. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958; pp. 20. Paper $1.00.

A DICTIONARY OF DIFFICULT WORDS. Compiled by Robert H. Hill. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959; pp. 351. $5.00.

SEEING AND WRITING: FIFTEEN EXERCISES IN COMPOSING EXPERIENCE. By Walker Gibson. New York: Longmans, Green, 1959; pp. xvi+159. $2.25.

THE ALIVE AND GROWING TEACHER. By Clark E. Moustakas. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959; pp. 157. $3.00.

INTRODUCTION TO PHONETICS. By Claude Merton Wise, illustrated by H. S. Wise. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958; pp. x+251. $3.95.

THE LOGIC & RHETORIC OF EXPOSITION. By Harold C. Martin. New York: Rinehart, 1958; pp. xii+204. $2.00.

FORT'S SPEECH FOR ALL. Revised by Edward E. Markert. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1959; pp. xii+287.

STAGE SCENERY AND LIGHTING. By Samuel Selden and Hunton D. Sellman. (Third edition.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959; pp. xviii+394. $5.50.

ALL THE WORLD'S A STAGE FOR SHAKESPEARE'S COMEDIES: A MODERN INTERPRETATION OF THE BARD'S HUMOR. By Frances C. DeBerry. New York: Exposition Press, 1958; pp. 130. $3.50.

LITERATURE: AN INTRODUCTION. By Hollis Summers and Edgar Whan. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. xx+706. $6.25.

EFFECTIVE BUSINESS SPEECH. By William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager. (Fourth edition of PRACTICAL BUSINESS SPEAKING.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. viii+445. $6.75.

EVERYBODY'S BOOK OF BETTER SPEAKING. By Dorothy Uris. New York: David McKay, 1960; pp. xii+267. $4.95.

INTRODUCTION TO MASS COMMUNICATIONS. By Edwin Emery, Phillip H. Ault, and Warren K. Agee. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1960; pp. xii+435. $5.00.

FORM AND THOUGHT IN PROSE. By Wilfred H. Stone and Robert Hoopes. New York: Ronald, 1960; pp. xii+686. $5.00.

ON ASSIGNMENT: READING AND WRITING. By Herbert Hackett and William Baker. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. x+339. Paper $3.25.

THE ORCHESTRA OF THE LANGUAGE. By Ernest M. Robson. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1959; pp. 206. $5.50.

YOU CAN TALK WELL. By Richard C. Reager, revised by Norman P. Crawford and Edwin L. Stevens. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1960; pp. xii+212. $3.95.

FIRST PLAYS FOR CHILDREN: A COLLECTION OF LITTLE PLAYS FOR THE YOUNGEST PLAYERS. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1960; pp. vi+295. $4.00.

DRAMA FOR WOMEN. By Alison Graham-Campbell and Frank Lambe, with a Foreword by Flora Robson. London: G. Bell, 1960; pp. 160. 12s. 6d.

PRINTING IN LONDON FROM 1476 TO MODERN TIMES. . . . By P. M. Handover. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. 224. $4.75.

THE SONG OF ROLAND. Translated by Frederick Bliss Luquiens, Introduction by Nathan A. Smyth. New York: Macmillan, 1960; pp. xxvi+101. Paper $0.95.

THE TROUBLE WITH LOVE. By Eve Merriam. New York: Macmillan, 1960; pp. viii+70. $3.50.

EFFECTIVE ENGLISH. By Philip L. Gerber. New York: Random House, 1959; pp. xviii+453. $5.50.

INTRODUCTORY COLLEGE ENGLISH FORM A. By Hans P. Guth. New York: Rinehart, 1959; pp. xiv+224. Paper $1.90.

MAINTAINING READING EFFICIENCY. By Lyle L. Miller. New York: Henry Holt, 1959; pp. iv+284. Paper $3.50.

BUILDING A BETTER VOCABULARY. By James I. Brown and Rachel Salisbury. New York: Ronald, 1959; pp. 124. Paper $2.25.

ORAL INTERPRETATION WORKBOOK. By Frederic W. Hile and Joseph A. Wigley. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1958. Paper $3.50.

RADIO AND TV NEWS EDITING AND WRITING. By Arthur Wimer and Dale Brix. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1959; pp. x+349. Paper $5.00.

EFFECTIVE SPEECH NOTEBOOK. By Robert T. Oliver and others. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1958; pp. 40. Paper $1.50.

TARTUFFE. By Molière, edited and translated by Haskell M. Block. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958; pp. xiv+82. Paper $0.45.

SHOP TALK

ROBERT L. SCOTT, *Editor*

SPEECH PROFESSORS AND THE "OUTSIDE WORLD"

Cut off as he is in his shop, ST depends heavily upon the gossip of those who come in and go out, and upon old magazines that are left lying about, for his news and opinions. Like any other agreeable, sympathetic shopkeeper, ST hears complaints. Recently a graduate student released his pent-up feelings at length in his presence. It seems as though this student had come to a certain university in order to study under a famous man (not a speech professor, we must report). He enrolled in three seminars from the famous man in a year's time, and saw the great professor on the average of twice per seminar. The man was forever flying here and lecturing there, consulting elsewhere and entraining beyond. The following year he went on leave—to Washington, D. C., the story goes. In the depths of desperation, the graduate student changed his major to speech. His assumption was that perhaps speech professors stay home.

An article in *The Reporter*, "The Affluent Professors" (June 23, 1960), has brought into the shop promise of good news. Spencer Klaw informs us that the professor's life has changed. He "is always being asked to fly somewhere: to 'cross-fertilize' a conference on city planning, to advise a government agency on how to cope with inflation or with Africa, to help an oil company teach its foremen how to get along with the men. In sophisticated business circles, to retain a team of consultants—from Columbia, say, or M.I.T.—is becoming a recognized status symbol, like owning a big electronic computer." The result is affluence; money pours into the ivory tower, or at least is carried back by the pockets full by the wanderers; furthermore, the professor's bargaining power within Academe is enhanced beyond the wildest dreams of the 1930's. But, according to Mr. Klaw, the picture is not all sunlight and roses: "The mounting traffic between the university and the world outside is raising serious questions. Everybody wants the professor to be mobile, well-heeled, and well-armed in negotiations with his dean. But if he is always holed up in his laboratory or flying somewhere, what is to become of his students?"

To determine whether speech professors are at work sharing academic affluence and whether their students wander about unattended, ST added a questionnaire to the well-stuffed envelopes referred to in the October Shop Talk. Certainly, ST reasoned, our observant departmental chairmen could provide the necessary intelligence to allow us to verify the graduate student's apparent assumption that speech professors stay home, and, if we discovered that they do not, to tell us what does become of their students. Of the 450 chairmen who received the packet, 176 dutifully returned the questionnaire. The questions asked and the responses given are indicated below.

Questions and Answers

1. Do one or more members of your department work professionally with business, industry, or government as:
   a consultant—61; a teacher of short courses

—95; an occasional lecturer—84; a researcher—40; (49 respondents checked none of these).

2. Are any members of your department released from their teaching load entirely or in part for any activities checked above?
Yes—19; No—136.

3. In your opinion, how do consulting, lecturing, etc., affect a faculty member's value to his department?
Increases value—132; Reduces value—5; No effect—18; (10 respondents indicated "that depends . . .").

4. In your opinion, how do consulting, lecturing, etc., affect a faculty member's contribution as a teacher?
Increases value—129; Reduces value—11; No effect—11; (12 respondents indicated "that depends . . .").

5. Does your school have any rules limiting the outside professional work a faculty member may perform?
Yes—82; No—89.
If no, should there be such regulations?
Yes—39; No—55.

Several conclusions seem abundantly clear. If the 176 replies are typical, speech professors are at least somewhat involved in professional work beyond the academic walls. The fact that few are relieved of academic duties, however, indicates that we are less intensely involved in serving business and industry than many of our fellows in the sciences and social sciences. We can reject with some confidence, therefore, the assumption that a speech professor necessarily stays at home, unconsulted by the world beyond. Perhaps we can also reject the premise that speech professors are conspicuously affluent in comparison with some of their colleagues in other disciplines.

The agreement by department chairmen that extra-curricular professional activities increase a professor's value to his department and his contributions as a teacher is overwhelming. The general trend agreed with the chairman who wrote, "Gives vitally needed contact with business world," and "Tends to make his teaching more practical." One man added that the professor's involvement in research projects for business, industry, or government might lead to employment for graduate students. Plainly the benefits of affluence may trickle down to the most needy.

In commenting on rules governing professional work performed for groups outside the cloister, the most commonly mentioned restriction was "no more than the equivalent of one day a week." This rule is cited by Mr. Klaw as being the governing mode in colleges and universities. Many of the respondents indicated that arrangements were most informal, but that the professor should keep his administrators advised and the administrators, in turn, would presumably keep in check any over-exuberant faculty person who might be tempted to over-burden himself with commitments.

ST cannot report these results without misgivings, although he hastens to add that the misgivings are not his own. Gaily he showed the results to a colleague, a man who has consulted and taught for a multitude of years, a man who can be accurately described as The-Kindly-Old-Advisor. "Here's a real problem that these men misunderstand," TKOA remarked, shaking his head sadly. "But shouldn't the speech professor be involved in the greater business of the outside world?" ST asked. TKOA replied:

"The trouble is we are seduced by businessmen, and all the rest who come to us. We should be involved in what you call 'the outside world' but as observers and critics, not as hirelings. What touches my conscience when I take $100 for my advice or for a workshop is that I become something other than a college professor. My responsibility now is to maintain the interests of my employers not to view them criti-

cally, not to interpret them for my students."

"But can't the professor play another role at times and still remain true to his academic duties?" ST asked.

"It's difficult not to get these roles mixed. The influence upon teaching may be quite subtle. The demands a professor makes upon his students may well be affected more than he realizes. Let me give you an example. I can remember years ago as a graduate student being in a seminar in which a paper was assigned by the professor. When we asked him to tell us more precisely what kind of a paper he wanted, he replied, 'Aim to write a paper which the editors of the *Quarterly Journal* would want to publish.' Recently a man in our field instructed a group of graduate students concerning a seminar project, 'Develop something that you could sell to business or industry as an article or a lecture.' I wonder if we can give our non-university employers a fair return, fair commitment, to their ends and needs and avoid cutting our own cloth in the classroom and laboratories to fit their purposes.

"I am further bothered, often, by the feeling that business and industry don't really want my advice and abilities. What they want to buy more than anything else is the gloss of scholarship. They want to feel that they've drawn from what is academic but are not willing to take the same sort of responsibilities that we would demand of our students. We pander to their tastes and interests if we are successful, which means if we are re-employed at an ever-increasing rate."

But TKOA's misgivings are shared by only a few department chairmen who objected that a professor cannot serve two masters effectively. The wisdom of the majority indicates that the trend in speech departments is toward more extra-curricular professional commitments, and that these activities are highly beneficial to the departments and to their students. ST will sort out more of the specific comments of the respondents to communicate to his customers in some subsequent issue.

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

National

Speech Association of America: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30 (1961, New York; 1962, Cleveland; 1963 [August], Denver).

American Educational Theatre Association: Waldorf-Astoria, New York, August 28-30; (1962, University of Minnesota, August 24-26; 1963, University of Oregon, August 26-28; 1964, University of Pittsburgh, August 27-29).

National Society for the Study of Communication: with SAA in St. Louis.

NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: with SAA in St. Louis.

Regional

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 13-15.

Southern States: Hotel Everglades, Miami, April 6-7 (High School and College Forensic Meet and Student Congress, April 3-7).

Central States: LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, April 14-15.

FORENSICS. A new chapter of Delta Sigma Rho has been installed at the State University of New York College of Education, Fredonia. Alan McLeod is chapter adviser.

A new student speech organization, the Michigan Forensic Guild, has been formed at the University of Michigan. Forensic Guild members, in addition to participating in campus debate demonstrations and radio discussions, will cooperate with the department of speech in sponsoring special intercollegiate events.

With the new trimester calendar, the University of Pittsburgh is developing a year-around debate program. The William Pitt Debating Union sponsored its second annual summer tournament in July. Seven colleges from Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky debated the desirability of recognizing the Communist government of China.

Radio and Television

The American University has received a construction permit for an FM broadcasting station to operate with a power of 5000 watts. In the planning stage are programs which will originate with the National Symphony Orchestra, the National Cathedral, the Smithsonian Institution, and various governmental, scientific, and cultural institutions. Arrangements for programs have already been made with the Broadcasting Foundation of America, the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, and the British Broadcasting Corporation.

Bob Jones University has added FM broadcasting to its facilities. WMUU-AM has been on the air since 1949. The FM broadcasting operations will extend broadcasting into the evening when the AM broadcasts leave the air.

Duane Tucker has organized a radio production workshop at Bowling Green State University this fall. Ninety students are participating.

Work has started at Illinois State Normal University on the construction of transmitters for a carrier current dormitory radio facility. This student operated service which will add closed circuit radio to closed circuit television should be in operation by September, 1961.

The division of radio-TV-film of the department of the University of Iowa in cooperation with KCRG-TV, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, is producing a series of thirteen public service programs entitled "Expedition Iowa." The first of this series featured films of the cinematography classes of John Kuiper.

Marquette University, planning "a comprehensive program of community education through radio and television," has announced the appointment of a new committee on radio and TV. Raymond T. Bedwell, Jr., head of the radio-television department of the school of speech, is staff assistant to the committee and will act as program administrator for radio and television in the division of continuing education.

Milton Rakeve, University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division, has been presenting a weekly program of news commentary over WBBM.

Reading Hours

Adelphi College has scheduled a readers theatre production of Christopher Fry's *The Boy With a Cart* as part of its 1960-61 season.

The readers theatre of American University will present two nineteenth-century plays: James A. Herne's *Margaret Fleming* in January and Boker's *Francesca Da Rimini* in May.

Beginning this fall, Hunter College is presenting a two-year extracurricular program of student readings in poetry and drama. The focus during the first semester was on the Greek period. In succeeding semesters the students will concentrate on Roman, Medieval, and Renaissance works.

The Readers Workshop of the University of Washington announces that Isaiah, Shakespeare, Christopher Fry, Henry James, Thomas Wolfe, and Neville Shute are authors whose works will be heard in campus programs planned for 1960-61. In addition to offering two campus readings each quarter, the workshop, under the direction of Wilma Grimes, provides readings for community organizations and events. In conjunction with KCTS-TV a quartet of advanced students plans a series of broadcasts of dramatic readings.

Notes from the Clinics

The third annual Summer Speech Clinic held at Humboldt State College was operated this year under the supervision of Clyde Rousey and R. E. Benham. Children treated in the clinic came from the Humboldt County area. College students in training received supervision in individual and group therapy, parent counselling, and group staffing of individual cases. In addition to speech therapy majors, students from psychology and education observed the operation of the clinic.

The Speech and Hearing Center at Ohio University established a new audiological service facility this fall. The diagnostic, rehabilitative, and research functions began October 1. Two new sound-proofed rooms have been set up in Jacobs Hall next door to the Speech Building.

The Speech Science Laboratory at Ohio University has recently completed the development of a special kind of speech noise. The noise, composed of speech, has a spectrum flat across the speech range. Research now in progress aims to test the masking efficacy of this noise in audiological and intelligibility studies, in comparison to saw-tooth noise, white noise, or filtered white noise. Inquiries should be addressed to Edward M. Penson.

During the summer, the department at the University of Washington in conjunction with the Washington State Department of Health and the Child Hearing League continued to operate a speech therapy program at Camp

Coeur d'Alene. The department in cooperation with the College of Education, and the department of psychology and the New School for the Special Child sponsored the "Northwest Summer Conference—The Special Child," July 25-29. Special lecturers included Harold Michal-Smith, New York Medical College, and Shulamith Kastein, Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center.

The speech and hearing clinic at Whittier College has moved into new quarters.

Theatre Schedules

Abilene Christian College: *Brigadoon, I Remember Mama, Tom Sawyer, Servant in the House.*

Adelphi College: *Great God Brown, Come Back, Little Sheba, Comedy of Errors.*

American University: *Beyond the Horizon, Mister Roberts, Fashion, The Scarecrow, Once in a Lifetime.*

Bradley University: *Of Thee I Sing, Ah, Wilderness!, Cyrano de Bergerac.*

Bowling Green State University: *You Can't Take It With You, Major Barbara, Antigone, Showboat, Julius Caesar, The Male Animal, No Exit, The Cenci.*

Cornell University: *Private Lives, Thieves' Carnival, The Gamblers, The Marriage Proposal, Squaring the Circle, Medea, Volpone.*

DePauw University: *Separate Tables, Night of the Auk, Merchant of Venice, Carousel.*

Furman University: *Quality Street, Caponsacchi* (from Browning's *Ring and the Book*), *Beggar on Horseback, Sweethearts.*

Georgetown University: *The Firstborn, Under Milk Wood, The Cocktail Party, Calliope* (a new musical), and a program of three new one-act plays.

Humboldt State College: *The Male Animal.*

Illinois State Normal University: *The Skin of Our Teeth, The Red Shoes, Antigone.*

Iowa State University: *Born Yesterday, First Impressions, Mistress of the Inn, Come Back, Little Sheba, Streets of New York, Mister Roberts.*

Johns Hopkins University: *A Touch of the Poet, The Servant of Two Masters, The Brass Butterfly.*

Kent State University: *The Solid Gold Cadillac, Cyrano de Bergerac, Electra, Pygmalion, The Tempest, Six Characters in Search of an Author, The Iceman Cometh.*

Lock Haven State College: *Arms and the Man.*

Long Island University: *Up From Everest* (a new play), *All the King's Men, Mister Roberts.*

Memphis State University: *The Matchmaker, The Diary of Anne Frank, Madame Butterfly, Julius Caesar,* and a program of one-acts.

Minot State Teachers College, South Dakota: *Teach Me How to Cry* (a new play), *The Madwoman of Chaillot, Oklahoma, The Torchbearers, U.S.A., Antigone,* and a program of one-acts.

North Central College: *Everyman Today.*

Northwestern University: *One Foot in America* (a new musical), *Antigone, The Bridge at Rio Campana, The Girl from Maxim's, King Lear, An Enemy of the People, The Quare Fellow.*

Ohio University: *Ladies in Retirement, Madwoman of Chaillot, Lute Song, Guys and Dolls, Volpone, The Scarecrow.*

Purdue University: *Life With Father, Cat on a Hot Tin Roof, The Crucible, The Boy Friend,* and a children's play, *Hansel and Gretel.*

San Diego State College: *Medea, The Visit, The Beaver Coat, You Touched Me, Twelfth Night.*

San Fernando Valley State College: *Tiger at the Gates, The Emperor's New Clothes.*

Southwest Missouri State College: *The Matchmaker.*

Stanford University: *Much Ado About Nothing, A Touch of the Poet, Waltz of the Toreadors, Peer Gynt.*

Stetson University: *The Skin of Our Teeth, Family Portrait, The Tempest, Stalag 17,* and a children's play, *Alice in Wonderland.*

Susquehana University: *The Madwoman of Chaillot,* and *The Corn Is Green.*

Texas Christian University: *The Dark at the Top of the Stairs, The Three Sisters, Jezebel's Husband, The Mistress of the Inn.*

Texas College of Arts and Industries: *Twelfth Night.*

Texas Technological College: *Ondine, Tea and Sympathy, The Merry Wives of Windsor, The World of Sholom Aleichem.*

University of Colorado: *Of Thee I Sing, Little Foxes, Billy Budd, Ah, Wilderness!, You Can't Take It With You.*

University of Connecticut: *Clerambard, Romeo and Juliet, Harvey, Rashomon, The Crucible,* and *Guys and Dolls.*

University of Delaware: *The Cradle Song, Taming of the Shrew, Twelfth Night, The Boy Friend.*

University of Georgia: *John Brown* (a new play).

University of Hartford: *The Good Natured Man, U.S.A., A Connecticut Yankee.*

University of Houston: *Very Love* (a new play).

University of Illinois: *The Servant of Two Masters, The Visit, Twelfth Night, Uncle Vanya, The Teahouse of the August Moon.*

University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division: *Good-by, My Fancy.*

University of Iowa: *Separate Tables, A Dream Play, Love for Love, The Boy Friend, Mother Courage, Troilus and Cressida.*

University of Kansas: *The Lady's Not for Burning, The Most Happy Fella, Look Homeward, Angel, Caucasian Chalk Circle, My Heart's in the Highlands,* and a children's play, *Greensleeves Magic.*

University of Maryland: *South Pacific, I Am a Camera, Julius Caesar, Streetcar Named Desire.*

University of Miami: *The Mischief Maker, The Great God Brown, The Visit, The Oresteia, The Merchant of Venice.*

University of Minnesota: *Look Homeward, Angel, Heartbreak House, Desire Under the Elms, The Merchant of Venice, The Visit.*

University of Nevada: *Ah, Wilderness!, The Rivalry, Our Town, The Male Animal,* and a program of one-acts.

University of Oregon: *Auntie Mame, The Cherry Orchard, Annie Get Your Gun, Sunrise at Campobello, The Enchanted, Hamlet.*

University of Pittsburgh: *The Time of Your Life, The Telephone, Trouble in Tahiti, Bloomer Girl.*

University of Southern California: *The King and I, The Bald Soprano* and *The Redemptor, Shadow of a Gunman, The Play's the Thing.*

University of Southwestern Louisiana: *Twelve Angry Women, Tiger at the Gates, Macbeth, The Importance of Being Earnest.*

Tulane University: *Waiting for Godot, Richard II, Death of a Salesman, The Possessed.*

University of Wisconsin: *Our Town, Cyrano de Bergerac, Kiss Me Kate, Cat on a Hot Tin Roof, Major Barbara.*

Washington State University: *The Rivals, Major Barbara, The Cave Dwellers, Seven Keys to Baldpate, Carmen.*

Wayne State University: *All the King's Men, The Waltz of the Toreadors, The Madwoman of Chaillot, Rashomon, An Enemy of the People, Much Ado About Nothing.*

Wellesley College: *Arms and the Man, Hedda Gabler, The Women of Trachis.*

Western Illinois University: *Charley's Aunt, Medea, Guys and Dolls, A Doctor in Spite of Himself, The Crucible.*

Whittier College: *The Cradle Song, Witness for the Prosecution, Leave Only Pride.*

Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology: *Bell, Book and Candle, She Stoops to Conquer, All My Sons, A Doctor in Spite of Himself.*

Woman's College of the University of North Carolina: *South Pacific, The Alcestis,* and a children's play, *Cinderella.*

Theatre Notes

Bowling Green University will take two bills of one-act plays, including one bill written by students, and a children's play on tour in northwestern Ohio during 1960-61.

Bradley University will present senior student Robert Jones in a touring one-man show, "Their Finest Hour," this season.

Adolphe Appia's "The Work of Living Art" and "Man is the Measure of all Things," translated by H. Darkes Albright and Barnard Hewitt, is available for the first time in English. The volume is a joint undertaking sponsored by the American Educational Theatre Association's committee on translation and publication of rare books and the University of Miami Press. It is the second of the Rare Books of the Theatre Series, edited by Barnard Hewitt.

The Playshop of Johns Hopkins University is sponsoring a series of "Drama Evenings" this year. Three lectures—Alan Schneider, "The Theatre in Transition"; Charles S. Singleton, "The Italian Theatre"; and N. Bryllion Fagin, "The New Drama in the United States and Europe"—will be accompanied by scenes from plays presented by the playshoppers.

The Mustard and Cheese Dramatics Club of Lehigh University is celebrating its Diamond Jubilee this year. The club was founded by Richard Harding Davis. As part of the jubilee celebration the club will present a series of European and American films.

Ohio University operates its summer theatre program in conjunction with community groups. The Ohio Valley Summer Theatre was established in 1950; in 1958, the University took over the management of the Monomoy Theatre at Chatham, on Cape Cod. During the past summer the Ohio Valley Theatre produced six plays; the Monomoy Theatre, eight. All members of both companies were registered

at the university and earned credit either at the undergraduate or graduate level.

The Southwest Missouri State College production of *Finian's Rainbow* has been chosen by AETA and the USO to tour Europe for seven weeks in the spring. The SWS Children's Theatre will tour schools throughout Missouri with *The Clown That Ran Away*.

Stanford University will be host to the Northwestern Drama Conference in February. Norman Philbrick, department head, is chairman of the conference. Plans include productions by Stanford, San Jose State College, Palo Alto Community Theatre, and Palo Alto Children's Theatre.

The State University of New York College of Education, Albany, has assumed sponsorship of the New York State Community Theatre Association. Paul Bruce Pettit, director of the University Theatre, is advisor to the association, and Edward J. Mendu, administrative secretary.

Texas Technological College will offer a European theatre tour next summer. Students will travel to theatrical centers and festivals in England, France, Germany, Austria, and possibly Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Six semester-hours credit may be earned.

The E 52 University Theatre, University of Delaware, has been selected to tour *The Boy Friend* for the Defense Department in Europe in the summer of 1961.

The University of Miami's drama department has been selected by the AETO and the USO for a tour to include Greenland, Newfoundland, Baffin Island, and Iceland in February. The company will play Moliere's *The Mischief Maker*.

The University of California at Los Angeles announces the John van Druten Award in Playwriting. Original scripts should be addressed to the Theater Arts Department by January 6, 1961. The award will be $1,000 and production.

Sundry Conferences and Lectures

The annual Abilene Christian College Lectures on Preaching were held October 3-6. The seven lectures were given by E. W. McMillan, President Emeritus, Ibarski Christian College (Japan).

The Ohio Conference for Speech Education was held October 8 at the Neil House, Columbus. Three groups cooperated in the conference: the Ohio Association of Secondary Teachers of Speech, the Ohio Association of College Teachers of Speech, and the Ohio High School Speech League. Twelve sectional meetings stressing both speech activities and classroom problems were held.

Thirty-six representatives of three major faiths participated in a refresher course in preaching, October 10, at Ohio University. Joseph F. King, minister of the First Church in Oberlin, Lawrence J. Flynn, Senior Jesuit at the Milford Novitiate in Milford, Ohio, and Eugene Mihaly, the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, led discussions on sermon composition, style, and delivery. Sermon criticisms were given by Paul Boase, Oberlin College; Thomas Ludlum, Capital University; and Lowell McCoy, Hebrew Union College. The workshop was organized and administered by Paul D. Brandes, Ohio University.

The thirtieth annual Rocky Mountain Speech Conference will be held on three weekends in February, 1961; the college division, February 2-4; the adult division, February 9-11; and the high school division, February 17-18. The general conference theme will be developmental listening and behavior. The principal speaker for the adult division and general session will be Ralph Nichols, University of Minnesota, president-elect of SAA. John T. Austen, University of Denver, is general chairman for the conference.

At a joint convention of the Texas Speech Association and Texas Speech and Hearing Association in October, these officers were elected: Texas Speech and Hearing Association—Tina E. Bangs, Houston Speech and Hearing Center, president; Sister Mary Arthur, Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, president-elect; Margaret Crabtree, Houston Independent School District, vice-president; Tom Abbott, Baylor University, secretary; and Lear Ashmore, University of Texas, treasurer. Texas Speech Association—P. Merville Larson, Texas Technological College, president; Betty V. Hughes, Wynn Seale Junior High School, Corpus Christi, vice-president; Angus Springer, Southwestern University, vice-president-elect; Reginald Holland, North Texas State College, executive secretary; Donald Streeter, University of Houston, executive secretary-elect; and Sara Bess McDougald, Nacogdoches High School, editor-historian.

A "Conference on Teaching Speaking and Listening in Secondary Schools" for teachers and principals of English and the language arts was held at the University of Washington on September 16 and 17. It was sponsored by the department of speech, the college of

education, and the Washington State Speech Association. The program was organized and directed by Oliver W. Nelson.

Curricula

Hunter College introduced this fall a program leading to the master of arts degree with a concentration in speech pathology and audiology.

The required speech course at Occidental College has been reorganized so that staff lectures are presented on Mondays before the entire freshman class. Norman Freestone, department chairman, is in charge of the course.

Two courses were offered for the first time this fall at Ohio University: renaissance theatre, taught by Cosmo Catalane, and renaissance rhetoric, taught by Lloyd Watkins.

The department at the State University of New York College of Education, Fredonia, began a curriculum in speech correction this fall. The program is under the direction of Henry Youngerman.

Three new seminars were offered in the fall trimester of the University of Pittsburgh: electronic acoustics, under Robert Bilger; seventeenth-century British music, poetry, and theatre, taught by Wilfred Mellers; and speech education, by William S. Tacey.

Three new courses have been added at Wellesley College: history of the theatre, oral interpretation, and phonetics.

Buildings

The department at Morehead State College, Kentucky, is looking ahead to the fall of 1961 when a new classroom building containing specially designed facilities for speech and theatre will be available. An experimental theatre and workshop will be included.

Occidental College dedicated its new Speech Building November 10. John W. Gassner, Yale, was the dedicatory speaker. The $650,000 building contains a stage, lobby, listening rooms, seminar rooms, and offices.

A two and a half million dollar Speech-Drama Building was occupied at San Fernando Valley State College this fall. Facilities include a four-hundred seat theatre, a studio theatre, concert hall, television and radio studio, creative drama studios, and scene shops.

The department at Tulane is now in its own building which includes classrooms, offices, and a new arena theatre.

Organization and Reorganization

At Morehead State College, Kentucky, the department was recently reorganized under the Division of Fine Arts. J. E. Duncan (music) chairs the division. Donald Loughrie heads the theatre, and Z. Brent Fry is in charge of the speech program.

This fall marked the beginning of course work in the newly organized department at Western Illinois University. Ronald C. Gee heads the department which offers work in general speech, dramatic art, public address, speech education, and speech correction. Students may obtain either a bachelor of education or bachelor of arts degree.

A new College of Fine Arts was organized at U.C.L.A. this fall. The department of theatre arts joins the departments of art and music "to form the nucleus" of the new college.

Grants

Dale E. Welgamuth, principal investigator, and Roger Penn, research associate, of American University are working under a Title VII grant to compare several types of student-to-teacher communication; their study is titled, "A Comparative Study of Three Techniques of Student Feed-back in Television Teaching: The Effectiveness of an Electrical Student Feed-back System."

A grant from the University of Missouri Research Council has enabled the speech and hearing clinic to purchase a sound spectrograph to aid in research on voice.

The Montana Educational Television Committee has received a grant of $21,450 from the Ford Foundation to carry out a study of the potential of television in meeting the state's educational needs. Erling S. Jorgensen is on leave from Montana State University to head the planning project.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, has granted the University of Pittsburgh $62,000 to strengthen the graduate program in speech pathology and audiology.

Appointments

Adelphi College: Donald Canty, Emil Hana, Hal Winter, instructors.

Boston University: Ernest C. Thompson, Jr., assistant professor.

Emerson College: Florence Hales, Bernadette MacPherson, Edna Ward, instructors.

Heidelberg College: John Ahart.

Humboldt State College: John McElhaney, assistant professor.

Hunter College: Marvin L. Seiger, Joseph W. Wenzel.

Illinois State Normal University: Ted Jackson, Alan Stambusky.

Lehigh University: Jane Hook.

Morehead State College, Kentucky: Donald Loughrie, Orley Holtan.

Nebraska State College, Kearney: Philip Jackson, Wesley Jensby.

Occidental College: John Leuken.

San Fernando Valley State College: Glenn Pierce, assistant professor.

Southwest Missouri State College: William Maynard.

Stanford University: Paul Landry, Hall Martin, assistant professors; Griffith Richards, instructor.

Susquehanna University: Bruce L. Nary, assistant professor.

Texas Christian University: William Hawes.

Texas Technological College: S. Walker James.

Tulane University: James C. Ching, Roy H. Longmire, assistant professors.

University of Alabama: Elizabeth Webster, acting director of the speech and hearing clinic; Kevin E. Kearney, Edwin W. Martin, assistant professors.

University of Dubuque: Frederick J. Speckeen, head of the department.

University of Houston: Carolyn Yarbrough, instructor.

University of Iowa: Howard Stein, visiting professor.

University of Kansas: Jed Davis, assistant professor; Cecil Coleman, Dan Costley, Caroline Kriesel, William Kuhlke, instructors.

University of Maryland: Rundell Buchanan, Lauren Ekroth, James Winter, to the overseas division.

University of Missouri: Howard Hill, professor; Jay Adams, Milton Bierbaum, Robert Dillard, Clyde Faries, Randall Fisher, William Mackie, Philip Watson, instructors.

University of Pittsburgh: Ralph Allen, Ned Bowman, assistant professors; Arthur Blum, Jay Lerman, instructors.

University of Southern California: Don C. Smith, associate professor.

University of Washington: Karl W. Cavanaugh, Robert M. Post, instructors.

Western Michigan University: Ronald Denison, Vlada M. Dimac, Casimir F. Schesky, Jr., instructors.

Western Illinois University: Robert L. Gregg, associate professor; Raymond Tucker, assistant professor; Winifred Golden, instructor.

Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh: Robert Carr, director of forensics.

Promotions

Air University: Francis A. Cartier, professor.

Emerson College: Kenneth Crannell and Haig der Marderosian, assistant professors.

Hillyer College: Edgar L. Klotenx, professor.

Humboldt State College: Milton Dobkin, chairman of the Language Arts Division.

Los Angeles State College: Louise Binder Scott, associate professor.

Luther College: Leslie G. Rude, chairman of the department.

San Fernando Valley State College: Fred McMahon, associate professor.

Southwest Missouri State College: Robert K. Gilmore, associate professor.

Tulane University: Robert C. Corrigan, associate professor; Paul Hostetler, executive director of the theatre.

University of Alabama: Marian Gallaway, professor.

University of Kansas: Kim Giffin, Bruce Linton, professors; Margaret Byrne, associate professor.

University of Maryland: Grover C. Niemeyer, associate professor; E. Thomas Starcher, assistant professor.

University of Southern California: John M. Kittross, assistant professor.

RETIREMENT. Helen G. Hicks retired from the faculty of Hunter College October 1, 1960.

On Leave

Brooklyn College: Helen Roach is on sabbatical serving as a visiting research fellow at Radcliffe College this year.

Fisk University: Gladys I. Forde is on leave serving as a visiting professor at Colby College. Filling her duties as technical director of the theatre this year will be Roger L. Askew.

Illinois State Normal University: Mable Clare Allen will be on leave during the second semester.

Montana State University: Erling S. Jorgensen is on leave this year making a study of educational television potentialities in Montana under a grant from the Ford Foundation. Herbert D. Seiter, producer-director of KQED-TV, San Francisco, will direct the radio-

television activities during Mr. Jorgensen's absence.

Stanford University: Leland Chapin is on leave during the fall quarter. He is traveling in Britain and studying Scottish rhetoricians at the University of Edinburgh. George Willey is on sabbatical leave this year.

University of Kansas: E. C. Buehler is on a year's sabbatical leave traveling in Europe. He expects to complete work on a textbook.

Whittier College: Frank Bock is on a year's leave to do graduate work at the University of Southern California. George Stroughton, University of New Mexico, will serve as technical director of the theatre in Mr. Bock's absence.

Henry Lee Ewbank, 1893-1960

Henry Lee Ewbank was born May 30, 1893 on a farm near Guilford, Indiana, and died in a Madison hospital, August 13, 1960. He had been a member of The University of Wisconsin faculty since 1927.

Professor Ewbank was graduated, *magna cum laude*, and Phi Beta Kappa, from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1917. He earned a master's degree at the University of Michigan in 1924 and a doctorate at Wisconsin in 1931. As an undergraduate he studied with Robert I. Fulton and, as a candidate for his second degree, with Thomas C. Trueblood.

Professor Ewbank began his college teaching at Albion in 1917. During World War I, he interrupted his professional career by enlisting in the United States Navy as a seaman. Later he received an ensign's commission.

In 1928, a year after coming to Wisconsin, he was appointed chairman of the University Radio Committee. In this capacity he played a major role in developing the policies and the program of WHA, "the oldest station in the nation." In 1945, he became the first chairman of the Wisconsin State Radio Council. For thirteen years he served in that important post with dedicated and wise leadership, until failing health compelled him to relinquish it to other hands. He taught in two summer sessions at the University of Southern California (1933 and 1936) and for a semester at the University of Hawaii (1948).

Throughout his busy academic life, he was most generous in devoting time and energy to professional organizations. From 1924-1930, he served as executive secretary and business manager of the Speech Association of America. In 1934-1935 he served as president of the Association. For two years, 1946-48, he was first vice-president of the American Association of University Professors and a member of Committee A. In the latter capacity he dealt tactfully and effectively with a number of sensitive problems of academic tenure. From 1931 to 1939 he was president of the national forensic honor society, Delta Sigma Rho. During his presidency a bitter controversy broke out over a constitutional restriction of membership to individuals of the white race. By patient and skillful use of the persuasive techniques about which he had written in his textbooks and which he had taught in his classrooms, he succeeded in getting the repeal of the discriminatory clause by a four-fifths vote of the chapters. In 1956, at the celebration of the Golden Jubilee of the society, seventeen men, chosen from the four thousand alumni members, were given special recognition for "illustrious achievement in public address and public affairs." Henry Lee Ewbank was named in this distinguished group, which included a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, two United States senators, and four university presidents.

In 1958, when Professor Ewbank resigned the chairmanship of the State Radio Council, he was presented with a citation crediting him with having directed more graduate research in radio and television than anyone else in the nation. During his thirty-three years at Wisconsin, he probably supervised more doctoral dissertations than anyone else in the fields of radio and television and public address.

Professor Ewbank was the author of several popular textbooks on speech fundamentals, radio and television, and discussion and debate. He was a frequent contributor to professional journals. He was a member of the editorial board which prepared and published the monumental *History and Criticism of American Public Address* in 1943.

Professor Ewbank is survived by his widow, Rachel Angelique Belt Ewbank, by a daughter, Mrs. William Malisch, and by a son, Henry Lee Ewbank, Jr., Associate Professor of Speech, Purdue University.

"Heine" Ewbank possessed a remarkable capacity for attracting and holding the respect and loyalty of his students. Without seeming to put any pressure on them he evoked the best they had to give. His office door was always open wide and he was ready, at all

hours of his long working days, to give himself freely and tirelessly to students who came to him for counsel and encouragement. He made them feel that their problems were his own. His sympathetic understanding and his kindly humor smoothed many a rough trail for those on their way to high academic goals.

To the last, throughout the tragically difficult years of his illness, he continued to work courageously on a projected history of the Wisconsin State Broadcasting System. Face to face with a cruelly progressive physical disability he did not quail. His gallant courage was an inspiration to all who knew him.

Conrad A. Elvehjem, President of the University of Wisconsin, said this of his colleague:

> Among the little group of far-sighted men gathered around primitive radio equipment in a painting on the wall of Radio Hall . . . is Henry Lee Ewbank, pioneer in educational radio. A kindly man with sly wit, an ability to make friends easily, and a rare knowledge of his subject, he was a national leader in the work to make the electronic communication media a force for social and cultural betterment, an idealist who lived to see many of his goals achieved not only in this state but, to some degree, throughout the nation.

A. T. WEAVER
The University of Wisconsin

MARGARET CAVE MCCLELLAN, 1911-1960

Margaret Cave McClellan, Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Florida for thirteen years, died on August third after an extended illness.

Miss McClellan was born June 17, 1911, in Jacksonville, Florida. She received her bachelor's degree, with honors, from the University of Florida in 1943, and her master's degree in 1948. Before going to the University of Florida, where she regularly offered courses in speech correction, speech in the elementary school, and speech fundamentals, Miss McClellan taught in the public schools of Jacksonville and served as a speech correctionist in Duval County, Florida. From 1956 to 1958 she was assistant professor of speech at Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia. Miss McClellan was a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Zeta Phi Eta, Delta Kappa Gamma, the Florida Education Association, and the American Speech and Hearing Association.

Miss McClellan will be affectionately remembered by all of her students, and especially by those who did their practice teaching under her supervision. Her death leaves an irreparable gap in the department in which she served and the community in which she lived.

D. W. EHNINGER
University of Florida

PERSONALS

Donald C. Bryant, University of Iowa, and Karl R. Wallace, University of Illinois, appeared on a program entitled "Speech for the Future" sponsored by SAA and the National Council of Teachers of English on November 25, in Chicago.

A grant from the Southern Universities Fund permitted Richard P. Douthit, Texas Christian University, to spend the summer doing research. Mr. Douthit was the only person in speech to receive a grant from the fund.

A Fulbright grant enabled Charles Elston, Hunter College, to study professional and educational theatres in India last term.

Wallace A. Gray, Hunter College, directed summer stock at Newport Playhouse, Newport, R.I.

Richard Hay, Stanford University, was director of design for the Ashland (Oregon) Shakespearean Festival during the summer.

During the past summer, Robert Henderson, American University, wrote and directed a short film about the New York Shakespeare Festival. The film, entitled *New York Madrigal*, was produced for the New York University Film Workshop.

Boyer Jarvis, University of Utah, has cancelled a year's leave of absence to work at Washington University on a Fund for Adult Education fellowship in order to accept a position as Acting Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences. Mr. Jarvis had been assistant dean.

Robert Loper has returned to Stanford University following a sabbatical year's leave in which he did research on Shakespearean production in London. He spent some time on the Continent, and returned to the United States to serve as director for the Ashland (Oregon) Shakespearean Festival in the summer.

At Columbia College in Chicago, Theodore V. Kundrat, chairman of the department of speech, has been appointed supervisor of practice teaching.

Jack Matthews, chairman of the department at the University of Pittsburgh, has been appointed a member of the Advisory Panel

of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Horace C. Rahskopf and Thomas R. Nilsen taught courses in speech at the second annual session of the Pacific Coast Savings and Loan School held on the campus of the University of Washington in September.

Glenn Reddick, head of the department of North Central College, taught a summer refresher course in speech for ministers of the Minnesota Conference of the Evangelical United Brethren Church. The course was given at the Summer Assembly of the Conference held at Lake Kornois, Minnesota.

Vera Roberts, Hunter College, directed the Tufts Arena Theatre and did research in the history of the theatre at the Huntington Library during the summer.

Horace Robinson, University of Oregon, has served as theatre consultant in the construction of new theatre buildings recently completed at Stockton Junior College and the University of New Hampshire. He is now advising during the planning stages of theatres for Harbor College, Pierce College, Los Angeles City College, and the College of the Desert. During October, he delivered addresses on theatre architecture at the University of Montana and Cornell University.

Zeta Phi Eta selected Alma Johnson Sarett, University of South Florida, to receive its first Zeta of the Year Award. A special plaque was presented to Mrs. Sarett at a luncheon in her honor, October 8, at the University of Florida.

George Shames, University of Pittsburgh, has been granted a one year traineeship by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. His principal interest will be study of aphasia. He will begin his study at the Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, and continue at other clinics.

Wayne N. Thompson has returned to the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois, after a semester on leave of absence. Mr. Thompson studied "Aristotle's System of Communication."

Jerry Turner, Humboldt State College, directed *Julius Caesar* at the Ashland (Oregon) Shakespearean Festival.

REMINDER. Mimeographed copies of the SAA Subcommittee on Contemporary Public Address study of campaign speaking in 1960 can be had without charge by writing to Paul H. Boase, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The study is an expansion of the two symposia published in *QJS*.

STUDY OVERSEAS. Next summer, as they have done for the past five years, the Comparative Education Society and Phi Delta Kappa's Commission on International Education will sponsor a seminar and field study abroad. The countries to be visited in 1961 are Denmark, Germany, Holland, and Belgium. The basic cost for the tour of study from August 13 to September 16 will be about $900. Anyone interested should address inquiries to Gerald H. Read, Secretary-Treasurer, Comparative Education Society, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

A NEW UNIVERSITY. The University of the Seven Seas is not only new but different. The nonprofit corporation is now negotiating for charter of a steamship in order to put the University in operation at sea by September, 1962.

The purpose of the University is to bring students and staff into contact with people and places around the world. The prospectus states, "The University of the Seven Seas contemplates district organization around the world with a minister and cabinet for international cooperation in education. It is expected that within each district as organized, the committee will determine major educational problems for the district, screen and select students assigned to the problem and enroll them for a semester aboard ship. . ."

E. Ray Nichols, Jr., chairman of the department of speech and drama, Whittier College, Whittier, California, is vice-president of the Board of Trustees of the University of the Seven Seas.

NAME CHANGE. Well, it's only "semi-official," our informant says, but you will notice that ST is now referring to the University of Iowa (Iowa City) rather than to the State University of Iowa. This may keep some of us from confusing correspondence with Iowa State University (Ames).